The Nation

Vol. CIII NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1916 No. 2672

Summary of the News

Those who foresaw a period of widespread labor troubles as a first result of the tumultuous yielding by President and Congress to the demands of the railway brotherhoods can find apparent justification of their forebodings in the events of the past week in New York. There a recrudescence of the traction strike, temporarily composed only a month ago, had by Sunday tied up virtually the entire system of surface cars in New York and Yonkers. The trouble first began on it becoming known that officials of the subway and elevated lines were inducing their employees to sign a so-called "master and servant" contract, binding them for two years. A strike of the subway and elevated systems was decided on on Wednesday of last week, spreading immediately to one of the surface car lines, among the employees of which similar contracts had been circulated. An ironical circumstance is that whereas, up to the time of writing, the strike has hardly interfered with the normal operation of the subway and elevated, it has extended to all of the surface car lines in New York and the vicinity.

President Wilson's conduct of the railway strike has afforded to the Republican candidate the issue of which he seemed to feel a lack. Beginning early last week, Mr. Hughes made the hasty eight-hour legislation the object of a succession of incisive attacks. Whether the addition of this issue will suffice to keep the conduct of the Republican campaign along the lines which it has so far taken, is an open question. Indications have not been lacking that influential Republicans are not wholly satisfied with the effect of Mr. Hughes's methods of attack on the policies of the Administration. There was the news last week that Col. Roosevelt is to take a more aggressive part in the campaign than was originally contemplated, and later reports are of a demand for a remodelling of methods of campaigning more in accordance with the Rooseveltian standard than with that heretofore set by the candidate himself.

Meanwhile the eight-hour legislation continues a topic of lively debate among railway managements. We take brief note in our editorial columns of the statement attributed to President Ripley, of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fé Railroad, that the Santa Fé did not intend to comply with the eight-hour law until ordered to do so by the United States Supreme Court. With the majority of railway presidents, no doubt, wiser counsels will prevail, and action as precipitate as that of Congress itself will be avoided. Indeed, Monday's New York *Times* contained the assertion that "there is a growing sentiment that the eight-hour law should not be attacked until after the election, and that, if Mr. Wilson is reëlected, there should be no attack if the President moves within reasonable time to get laws that will lift the burden of the short day from the carriers."

The Administration's much-debated Shipping bill was finally signed by the President on September 7.

The State elections in Maine on Monday, which are generally regarded as having an important bearing on the Presidential election in November, resulted in a decisive victory for the Republicans. The plurality for the Republican candidate for Governor is estimated, as we write, at 13,000. In addition, the Republicans elected two United States Senators and four Representatives in Congress, and carried the State Legislature.

The treaty between the United States and Denmark for the purchase of the Danish West Indies for $25,000,000 was ratified by the Senate on September 7. In Denmark, opposition to the measure appears to continue vigorous. Efforts made last week to get the matter settled through the formation of a coalition Cabinet broke down, and, unless proposals which, it was stated, were to be brought forward by the Government on Tuesday should prove more acceptable, it would appear that the question can only be disposed of by a general election.

Congress adjourned on Friday of last week, concluding a session which had lasted nine months and two days. Under normal circumstances, it will reassemble on December 4. On the eve of adjournment the General Revenue bill was passed, carrying appropriations of $205,000,000. Certain changes were made in the bill at the eleventh hour, the most important being a modification in the retaliatory measures authorized for the purpose of combating the Allies' blockade and blacklist. In particular, the Phelan amendment, giving the President power to close the mails, telegraph service, and cables to any nation that restricted mail service to the United States, was eliminated. Previously, in conference, the elimination had been agreed to of all stamp taxes objected to by the House.

The most sensational news of the war during the past week was that received on September 7 of the capture by the Bulgar-German army of the Rumanian fortress of Tutrakan, on the south bank of the Danube. According to the German statement (which is described by Bucharest as exaggerated), 20,000 prisoners, a number of heavy guns, and a large quantity of munitions were taken with the fortress. Sunday's announcement from Berlin recorded the capture of a second fortress, Silistria, twenty-five miles east of Tutrakan, and sixty miles southeast of Bucharest. The extraordinary thing about this Bulgar-German movement is that it is coincident with that of the Russian army in Rumania, which is pressing down towards Bulgaria along the shore of the Black Sea. The recapture by these forces of Dobric (the Bulgarian occupation of which had only been reported on the previous day) was recorded on Saturday, and unofficial reports in Monday's papers stated that the Bulgarians were evacuating Varna, their principal port on the Black Sea. In Transylvania meanwhile, the Austrians have retired still further before the Rumanian advance.

On the Somme front, the Anglo-French advance, the beginnings of which we recorded last week, has been continued, and this phase of the offensive was presumably brought to a close at the end of last week, by which time the British had obtained complete hold on Ginchy and Leuze Wood, and the advance of the French had taken them to the outskirts of Chaulnes and put them in command of the railway line between that place and Roye. Severe German counter-attacks have been everywhere repulsed, and apparently all of the ground gained has been held. The British statement on Sunday summarized the week's gains as having taken place on a front of 6,000 yards, to a depth varying from 300 to 3,000 yards.

From the eastern front, little news of importance has been received since September 7, when Petrograd announced the occupation of the railway lines between Halicz and Semikovitze and Wodniki, and the fact that Halicz itself was being bombarded. The Russian statement of the following day told of the crossing the Gnita Lipa. Since that time the advance has apparently been checked, and from Berlin on Monday came the statement that attempts to take the fortress had been frustrated.

The little news that has come through from Greece indicates that the Allies are in full control of the situation, and that Athens is virtually under martial law. A disturbance which took place before the French Legation on Saturday of last week was apparently engineered by the Reservists' League, of which King Constantine is honorary president. In consequence of the disturbance, the Allies have demanded that the League be dissolved, and unofficial dispatches from Athens on Monday declared that the King had accepted the demand. An official bulletin issued in Paris on Monday announced that on the Macedonian front British troops had crossed the Struma and were attacking the Bulgarian forces.

Dispatches from London of Sunday's date gave the substance of a somewhat acrimonious exchange of notes between Great Britain and Sweden on the question of the Allies' blockade and Sweden's retaliatory measures in seizing mails between England and Russia. Sweden has declined to comply with the British suggestion that, pending arbitration of the matter, the measures of retaliation should be suspended, and Viscount Grey has replied that adoption of the suggestion must be regarded as a necessary precedent to any arrangement involving recourse to arbitration.

An official celebration of the second anniversary of the battle of the Marne was held throughout France on Sunday.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Week

The fundamental question in the controversy over the traction strike in New York is the question of fair play. Did Mr. Shonts, in engineering his scheme of organization for the Interborough, and in instituting his plan of two-year contracts to be signed individually for the employees, wantonly invite the struggle that has come on? Was it a move expressly designed to undo the result supposed to have been accomplished by the settlement that ended the controversy between the New York Railways Company and its employees, and which was embodied in the agreement of August 7? In his refusal to permit the rightfulness of these doings to be passed upon by an impartial board of inquiry, was he violating an obligation, not expressly entered into indeed, but nevertheless resting morally upon him, to pursue the same general attitude towards arbitration as head of the Interborough to which he pledged himself as head of the New York Railways Company? To all these questions the answer which seems on the face of things to be correct is, Yes. That he was bound to refuse all discussion on the ground that to admit it would be to put in question the obligation of contracts obtained without coercion, is a plea that will not bear examination. The question was not whether the men had a right to repudiate their contracts, but whether the policy embodied or exemplified in them was fair and expedient, and, if not, whether it was the duty of the company to abandon that policy. Upon this question there is no reason in the world why light should not have been thrown by fair inquiry.

On the other hand, the car men on the surface lines have put themselves in the wrong by striking in violation of express agreement to submit all disputes to arbitration. And that public opinion will condemn in still stronger measure a resort to such a general system of sympathetic strikes as has been threatened, is quite certain. Before the labor unions of this city enter upon any such desperate policy, they will do well to consider the irreparable permanent injury they will be doing to their own future, if they have no compunction as to the severe temporary injury they will be inflicting upon the people of New York. But while all this is so, the traction managers will be making a most deplorable mistake if they imagine that in the public wrath against mischief-making labor leaders their own misdoings will be forgotten. What is wanted of them, no less than of the unions, is obedience to the public demand for fair play, and consideration for the permanent interests of the community. Unfortunately, there is no law in existence at present which provides the means of compelling a resort to rational methods; but Mayor Mitchel, in the name of the interest and the moral sense of the whole community, can demand that both sides come before him and such other men of standing and unquestioned just-mindedness as he may designate, with a view to bringing about a fair settlement. With the overwhelming force of public opinion that would back such a move, it would be almost incredible foolhardiness for either side to stick to an attitude of uncompromising belligerency.

The chief merit of the revenue measure which the Senate has been debating for a fortnight, and which was passed on Thursday of last week, is that it constitutes another advance towards the historic goal of the party now in power—the substitution of direct taxation for the protective tariff. Assuming for the moment that the expenditure represented by the extra levy was unescapable, the means adopted to raise the $205,000,000 are to be commended. By additions to the income tax, an estimated sum of $110,000,000 is to be obtained; by an inheritance tax, about $20,000,000; by a tax on munitions of war, over $70,000,000, and by miscellaneous fresh taxes, three or four millions more. The total estimated excess of disbursements over receipts this year is more than a quarter of a billion dollars. What part of it the emergency bill will not cover will be found in the general balance fund of nearly $70,000,000—the largest general balance for eight years.

As to the necessity for all of this extra levy of over $200,000,000, there has been the sharpest division of opinion in the debates; and the evident fact that the bi-partisan "preparedness" measures are responsible for most of it does not lessen the force of some Republican arguments. Speakers in the Senate have pointed to a number of Democratic appropriations as grossly useless. Foremost is the $42,000,000 carried by the Rivers and Harbors bill, which is greater than the appropriation of last year by $22,000,000, and admittedly contains much "pork"—though there were Republicans who voted for it. The $20,000,000 provided for a nitrate plant is denounced, and the $11,000,000 for an armor-plate plant. Some have found fault with the Shackleford Good Roads bill, which commits the Government to the ultimate expenditure of $85,000,000 to help the States, of which $6,000,000 is now appropriated. A few bold Republicans have even attacked the Rural Credits bill, which carried $15,000,000 for the institution of its system. Condemnation is general of the Shipping bill, with its $50,000,000 for the leasing or buying of vessels. The Public Buildings bill, which carried $30,000,000, has happily been sidetracked. But the Republican platform asserts that the Democrats have created 30,000 new Federal positions, and the yearly additional appropriations for them are declared to approach $30,000,000. The estimated appropriations for the next fiscal year reach the unprecedented sum of $1,580,000,000 For this the "preparedness" hysteria is chiefly responsible; but enough of it is due to wasteful legislation to make a serious contribution to the total. It is deplorable that the country has made so little progress towards a budget system.

Mr. Hughes has been throwing more and more energy into his attack upon the recent abject action of Congress in the matter of the railway wage. In his speeches in Maine he made his points with particular effectiveness. It is especially to be noted that what he drives at is not, except in a very minor degree, the question of arbitration of labor disputes, but the question of governmental rectitude. And, if he is not the most polished of stylists or the most eloquent of orators, he has behind his words a record of acts in perfect keeping with them. In one of his speeches he declared that anybody who charges him with not being a friend of labor "knows that he is not telling the truth"; but, he went on, "I do not agree with all that labor proposes," and gave this illustration:

> I fought, for example, the Full Crew bill. It applied generally to all railroads in the State. It was admitted upon argument before me that in some cases it was not needed, and it would require the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars unnecessarily. I said I could not sign a bill like that. We had a Public Service Commission, where complaints could be entertained and orders could be made which were properly adapted to the exigencies to which they relate. What we want in this country is fairness and justice, nothing else.

This is more to the purpose than any amount of fine language. Yet we find Mr. Hughes making many a telling hit in his treatment of this theme upon which he feels so strongly. Thus at Bangor:

> We cannot have Congress acting on the demand of the Executive before it knows what it is doing and with the whole American people looking on aghast at such abandonment of executive prerogative and of Con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gressional duty. I yield to no one in my desire to have these matters settled equitably. The bill to which I have referred carried on its face in large warning the declaration of its own defect. It proceeded to absolutely impose a wage scale, and then to direct that somebody find out whether it had any business to do it.

That last sentence is not so bad for a man who is not given to the making of epigrams.

President Ripley's statement that the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fé Railroad will not obey the Eight-Hour law until "ordered to do so by the Supreme Court" is extremely mischievous. If it is merely an awkward way of expressing that railway's desire to test the law in our highest court, it is understandable. But the language itself is that of lawlessness, and Mr. Adamson, the father of the bill, has been quick to seize upon this aspect of it. If the law is unconstitutional, it will be set aside by the courts; if it is rankly unjust, the recourse is to the court of public opinion, which, from every indication, is leaning clearly to the side of the railways. It would only take, however, a few utterances like this of Mr. Ripley—who fortunately has thus far had no imitators—to cause the pendulum to swing back. There are plenty of people as it is who, remembering the railways' past misdeeds, take a certain satisfaction in seeing them punished now, even though unjustly.

"Any party which surrenders fundamental principles to the exigencies of the hour is courting defeat." Thus, truthfully, spoke Senator Underwood last week. His indictment of his party and its President was in relation to the dyestuff schedule—the levying of a protective tariff by the Democracy which has a thousand times denounced tariffs for protection as a robbery of the people. Despite the soundness of his position, Mr. Underwood carried only six Democratic Senators with him. What he says of this surrender of principle is equally true of the numerous others which have led many to believe that Mr. Wilson will sacrifice any of the party's principles for political expediency. If the situation were an ordinary one, such as existed at the time of the enacting of the Payne-Aldrich tariff, the Democracy would, we believe, not only court defeat, but receive it. The loss of faith in Mr. Wilson would cost the party dearly. In the confused cross-currents of this campaign which make it impossible to centre public attention on any one issue or any one betrayal of the party by the Administration, lies Mr. Wilson's best hope of escaping a reckoning and of making needless Senator Underwood's warning. That even a handful of men has stood firm gives at least the hope that, when these turbulent times are over, the Democracy may return to those fundamental principles for which Grover Cleveland stood like a rock.

Senator Underwood did not stand exclusively upon general principle in fighting the provision for a tariff on dyestuffs. There is good reason for believing that it is a piece of unscientific lawmaking, and he pointed out specific weaknesses with effect. Manufacturers of dyestuffs in the hearings, as he said, have testified that a much lower rate of duty than that imposed would equalize the difference in cost of production in Germany and America. An impost ranging from 80 to 140 per cent., as against the present average of 30, is surely excessive. The complex dyestuffs industry, built on a number of other industries whose by-products it uses, and closely connected with the textile, paint, and paper industries, is one which will require careful study by the Tariff Commission. Meanwhile, the Democrats should at least not rush into exaggerated rate-making. With what effect the Republicans will employ the clause was recently shown by Penrose, who proclaimed that "it constitutes a complete admission that we must be industrially independent . . . and that we should have protective duties that will maintain diversified industries and protect the home market and insure ample wages." It will be the text for many a high-tariff orator. As it will not be effective till after the war is ended, we might have waited longer to determine our action.

Every day brings its list of Progressives who have come out for Hughes or have come out for Wilson, with a statement of reasons annexed. And too often it is made plain that they come not as Progressives at all, but simply as men and women who prefer Hughes or who prefer Wilson, if not indeed as former Republicans and former Democrats. What, for example, is there in Gifford Pinchot's stated motives for his return to the Republican fold that would show he comes from the Progressive camp instead of the Socialist camp or the Prohibition camp? Mr. Wilson's weakness in the Lusitania matter, Mr. Wilson's vacillation with regard to Mexico, above all Mr. Wilson's refusal to take sides "on the greatest moral issue of our time," namely, the side of the Allies in the great war—these have shaped Mr. Pinchot's action. Now these reasons may be more than sufficient to justify Mr. Pinchot the individual in voting against Mr. Wilson, but there is nothing which should drive Mr. Pinchot as one of the leaders of Progressivism to come out against Mr. Wilson, unless we take it that Progressivism, being essentially a moral movement, is naturally concerned with moral issues even if they are fought out in Europe. Of the great social programme upon which the Onward Christian Soldier movement of 1912 was based, Mr. Pinchot mentions just one issue—conservation; and in that he has a sort of proprietary interest. It all comes down to this: "As a Progressive I like Mr. Hughes much more than I do Mr. Wilson," or the other way about.

The vote of the Senate last week putting extraordinary powers in the hands of the President with which to retaliate against Great Britain's interference with American shipping, trade, and mails, ought to surprise no one, least of all the London Foreign Office. Its officials have had warning enough in all conscience that American patience was nearing an end, and the warnings have by no means come exclusively from American sources. Thus the *Manchester Guardian*, in a leading editorial of August 17, pointed out that various English influences, particularly England's policy towards Ireland, were arousing suspicion and resentment in the United States. It dwelt at length upon the anxieties aroused here by the economic conference of the Allies in Paris, but it made the mistake of dismissing the Orders-in-Council, the censorship, the blacklist, and interference with American mails as of lesser moment. These acts have been growing increasingly exasperating, notably since the British Foreign Office has undertaken to regulate just what the American people shall and shall not read. As for the Senate's proposals, it must be remembered that they give the President power which will be available not only in this war, but in any future conflict. Even as modified they remain drastic enough. We cannot at this hour believe that a situation is likely to arise that would compel the President to resort to such extreme measures. They should, however, serve as a timely warning to the British Foreign Office.

The outstanding fact in President Wilson's speech of encouragement to the suffragists is the pronounced, if only implied, weakening of his opposition to the achievement of equal suffrage by Federal amendment. "We feel the tide," he said; "we re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

joice in the strength of it; we shall not quarrel in the long run as to the method of it." Again, he declared himself "a little impatient sometimes about the discussion of the channels and methods by which suffrage is to prevail." Yet the President has heretofore expressed in the strongest terms his own profound concern over the method by which suffrage should win forward, and his objection to its attainment by means of a Federal amendment: "I am tied to a conviction which I have had all my life that changes of this sort ought to be brought about State by State," he declared on January 6, 1915. "It is a long-standing and deeply matured conviction on my part, and therefore I would be without excuse to my own constitutional principles if I lent my support to this very important movement for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States." The President may partially reconcile these two positions by emphasizing his words of last week about the strength of the suffrage tide: once the tide has become overwhelmingly strong over all the nation, it might be argued, the question of methods, of breaking down old legal barriers, is immaterial. But this is a strained interpretation of his last declaration, and one that will not greatly comfort those who feel, as he once did, that, irrespective of the desirability of suffrage, the "method" is of paramount importance.

A mixed result in the primary election in Wisconsin leaves uppermost the fact that La Follette, who in April won a majority of the delegates to the Republican Convention with humiliating difficulty, will probably again be Senator from that State. The State is normally so Republican—the majority for that party in the Gubernatorial election of 1914 was 21,000—that the victory of the old radical over his conservative Republican opponent, Malcolm G. Jeffris, will be regarded as equivalent to a final choice. The personal strength of the man alone gave him his majority, for the Phillips, or stalwart, faction won without difficulty on the State ticket. Wisconsin is through with the La Follette brand of progressivism in home affairs; but there is at least one aspect in which the country at large may find pleasure in his renomination. The hardest fight against him was made because, as the Milwaukee *Sentinel* put it, in voting for the Underwood tariff, "he misrepresented his own State and forfeited the support of all concerned for the prosperity of . . . her basic interests." Even the rural papers could write (we quote the Dodgeville *Chronicle*) that "at a critical hour he turned his back to the farmers and voted to make their products free." In the event of general Republican success, we shall have protectionists enough in the Senate without another from La Follette's State.

Ohio has made a promising start in dealing with the outrage at Lima, where, two weeks ago, a mob stormed the jail and all but lynched the Sheriff in an attempt to get its hands on a negro prisoner. The Allen County grand jury last week returned indictments against sixteen of the would-be lynchers, including "several business men," and thirteen of the sixteen were promptly arrested. All praise is due to the authorities for their dispatch, and to the members of the grand jury for their courage. Ohio's handling of the disgraceful affair seems, so far, to be in marked contrast to the apathy and cowardice shown by such States as Georgia and Texas in dealing with these horrors. Meanwhile the prisoner awaits trial for murderous assault. Let swift justice be done to him—and to the men who sought to wipe out one crime by another as foul!

An "outburst of loud and continued applause," says a special cable to the New York *Times*, greeted the following declaration by President Harry Gosling, in his speech at the opening of the forty-eighth annual meeting of the British Trades Union Congress at Birmingham:

> Many there are, some from sordid motives, others with a desire for revenge, who speak and write exultantly of trade wars and tariff wars. We are not going to let it be supposed that we countenanced our entry into this terrible war for the purpose of capturing German trade. Our motives, I mean the motives of the overwhelming majority, in entering this war were to enforce recognition of treaties.

Evidently the programme which proposes perpetuation of international ill-will, of mutual injury, of sleepless enmity between neighboring peoples in time of peace, is not going to be put through in England without a determined struggle. This manifestation of sentiment by a great assembly of British workingmen is one of the first strong indications of the protest that is coming. But that protest is sure to gather weight and volume as time goes on. The force of the sentiment behind England's grand policy of free trade was demonstrated to the confusion of Mr. Chamberlain when he made his protectionist crusade after the Boer War. It will have to meet now a more formidable enemy in the shape of the passions aroused by the present gigantic conflict; but on the other hand it will be reinforced by the tremendous power of the deep-seated moral sentiment of which the incident at the Trades Union Congress gives some indication.

Mr. Root's recent speech to the American Bar Association upon standards in law has had a most promising sequel. The section on legal training has completed ten years' work upon proper standards for admission to the bar; the rules it has suggested at Chicago will be voted on at the next meeting. It is hoped that all States can be persuaded to enact them into law. The first requirement is that examinations in each State shall be conducted by a board appointed by the highest appellate court, and that no law diploma shall take their place. Strict and detailed credentials as to character are demanded, two of them from lawyers. Students shall be officially registered upon the commencement of their course of preparation; but no student shall be entered until after he has passed the necessary requirements for entrance to the collegiate department of his State University, or to a college approved by the board. All applicants shall be compelled to study law for four years, the first three of which must be spent in completing the prescribed course at an approved law school. The subjects in which the candidates must be prepared are also listed by the Association, while there are minor requirements. These standards will seem unduly high in many States where laxity prevails, and it is held that the bar should be "democratic." But they are demanded by legal and judicial progress, and there is no reason why the Bar Association should not be as successful in obtaining them as was the American Medical Association in advancing medical standards.

It is to be wished that the case of the artist Blakelock, and his pathetic delight when returned last week through the Blakelock Fund to a rural studio and sanitarium, might be the means of awakening a new interest in the urgent subject of the after-care of the insane. Only the genius of Blakelock saved him, after seventeen years, from being looked upon to the last as social refuse. He will now be under close, but not irritating, supervision for six months. The out-treatment of nearly all the curably and mildly insane, under scientific supervision, might be arranged for upon a similar plan. New York, her hospitals intolerably overcrowded, is already taking steps towards such an arrangement; the release of patients on parole is permitted, and the State has four or five after-care agents.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ISSUE OF CHARACTER.

Mr. Hughes's speech at Nashville last week may well prove to be the turning point of his campaign. By this we do not mean that it will determine, or even that it will directly go far towards determining, the result of the election. Voters will divide on many issues, more or less definite; they will be influenced by many impulses of sentiment or of habit, upon which Mr. Hughes's declaration on the question of the snap-judgment "eight-hour" legislation will have little influence, either favorable or unfavorable. But there is one issue upon which the conduct of the Republican candidate in the presence of his Nashville audience has a decisive bearing. That issue is the personality of the candidate himself. It was upon that issue, be it remembered, and upon that issue alone, that he was nominated; it was not owing to his special views on any particular question, but to his character and record as a public servant deserving of the highest trust, that he was preferred above all other aspirants by the unmistakable voice of the party. And it has been an almost incredible misfortune to him that up to last week this element in his candidacy, supposed to be far and away its greatest asset, had simply not entered at all as a factor in his campaign. Not only had it not entered as a positive factor, but his standing was being undermined by what appeared to be the painful absence of it. People were asking every day, What has become of the Hughes we knew?

Well, the Hughes we knew is the Hughes who spoke his mind at Nashville. The personal impression he made by his general bearing in the face of a hostile audience, the personal triumph he won by his firm tact and quiet courage, were but a small part of what he accomplished. It is his clean-cut declaration on the recent surrender of the Government at Washington to threats by labor unions that will serve as the unquestionable reminder of what the country has always known Hughes to be. There was in it neither bluster nor fine language; there was in it simply that note of unbending rectitude which has been the distinguishing mark of his entire career in public office. "I am opposed," he declared, "to being dictated to, either in the executive department or in Congress, by any power on earth before the facts are known, and in the absence of the facts." Let the Brotherhoods rage, if they will; let demagogues rant, and spineless onlookers shake their heads; Mr. Hughes plants himself on the firm rock of principle, and takes the consequences, be they what they may. What he *says* to-day is no more than what he *did* when, as Governor, he vetoed the two-cent fare bill. And the American people can count on his acting with the same unfaltering rectitude in any situation in which he may be placed if invested with the authority of the Presidency. Not the power of wealth nor the pressure of the populace nor threats of labor unions will swerve him from following the dictates of his clear convictions.

Only last week we spoke of the pained disappointment with which Mr. Hughes's friends and admirers have been reading his campaign speeches. It would be absurd to contend that this feeling will at once disappear, in consequence of a single assertion of force and character. But on the other hand it is only just to say that the Nashville speech, coupled with his uncompromising refusal to soothe German-American susceptibilities at St. Louis, must compel a revision of judgment. His campaign has not been an impressive one; it has fallen far short of what it might have been. But in the light of what Mr. Hughes has now done, in relation both to the labor vote and to the German-American vote, the one most damaging criticism upon his campaign falls to the ground. His bearing in regard to the subject of Germany has been widely ascribed to fear of the German-Americans or desire to retain their favor. We could wish that it had been far other than it has been; we could wish that, even at the last, he had chosen some better way of confuting that view than by a blanket endorsement of Col. Roosevelt's speech, with all its crudities and absurdities, and its personal abuse of the President. But confute it he has. No longer can German-American organs with a shadow of reason claim him as an ally. The man that stood before the German-Americans of St. Louis, as he did the other day, the man that at Nashville calmly threw down his gage on the issue of labor-union domination, is not a man against whom the charge of "pussy-footing" can hereafter be made with much effectiveness.

The issue which Mr. Hughes's declaration at Nashville brought to the front of the political stage has since been attracting ever-increasing attention. Whether it will assume a position of cardinal importance in the campaign is still, however, to be seen. And there will, in any case, remain, in addition to the personal attributes of the candidates, other questions of prime importance, especially two. On the question of our relations with Mexico, there is a sharp confrontation of the opposing sides, certainly as regards the past, probably as regards the future. On the tariff, the contrast is not so pronounced as it has been in former campaigns, or as it would be in this but for Mr. Wilson's concessions to protectionism; yet clearly the Republican side stands for protection as a principle and the Democratic side against it. These two great elements in the contest will weigh powerfully in the scales with voters who are as yet undecided, a multitude probably far surpassing in number what has been known at the corresponding stage of any former Presidential campaign. But, while the force of these and other elements in the contest remains unimpaired, the campaign has, in one most important respect, taken on, in consequence of Mr. Hughes's declaration at Nashville, a new and a more inspiriting character.

MR. WILSON'S CONGRESS.

In the session which came to a close on Friday of last week, Congress lived up to the now familiar Wilsonian standard in volume of achievement. On whatever points opinion may differ as to Mr. Wilson's powers, there can be no doubt that he has demonstrated an ability to keep Congress at work, and to get out of it action upon large and controversial subjects, beyond all precedent. To this power and its unrelenting exercise must be ascribed the first—and what still remains the most unquestioned—legislative achievement accomplished in his Administration. Few thought it possible that he would be able, in the first Congressional session of his term of office, to keep the national legislators' noses to the grindstone, after their trying labors over the Tariff bill, long enough to secure the enactment of the Banking and Currency law which established the Federal Reserve system. His success in doing so, and in steering the bill through its manifold difficulties, has proved to be but a foretaste of what has since become established as the expected order of the day.

It cannot be said of the session just closed that constructive legislation of anything like such far-reaching character has been enacted; unless indeed that term be applied to the "preparedness" appropriations which, as the initiation of a new policy, may prove to be as momentous in their effect as the enactment of any statute law. But these appropriations have been put through, upon a scale far transcending anything which not many

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

months ago would have been thought without the bounds of possibility; and antecedent to this, legislation recasting the entire military system of the country had been put through. Among the acts which stand out in addition to these are, particularly, the Rural Credits law, the act creating a Tariff Commission, the Philippines Government act, the Child Labor law, and the long-contested measure which puts the Government into the shipping business; besides others that have given rise to less discussion. Some of the measures we have mentioned have been passed, at least so far as regards their main content, without serious difference of opinion as between the two great parties. Others have been put through as distinctively party acts. But it may be said of nearly all of them that the driving power behind them was that of the President. Left to themselves, more than one of these legislative projects would either have been defeated by sheer opposition or obstruction, or would have got entangled in difficulties of detail which would have effectively prevented their enactment into law in the present session.

Of his dominating influence over national legislation, Mr. Wilson is far from making a secret. He regards it as the proper rôle of the executive head of our Government. Just how far, in this, he differs from his predecessors, is an interesting question, and one to which the answer is by no means simple. The complexity of government, the gigantic character of the nation's interests, and the extension of the scope of governmental functions have been for at least a generation steadily producing a trend in the direction of increasing Executive influence upon the course of legislation. Not only have the Presidents themselves felt the necessity of exercising this influence, but the nation has long been accustomed to look to the White House as the one place upon which the desires of the nation, the demands of public opinion, must be focussed if orderly progress is to be made. It is only in the case of Mr. Wilson, however, that the conviction of the rightfulness of this development, and of its inevitable extension to a definite goal, has been held in the form of a fully avowed doctrine. Indeed, the one principle to which Mr. Wilson has been steadily faithful throughout his career, the one doctrine which found thorough lodgment in his mind in the days of his theoretical dealing with governmental questions and has remained undisturbed during his practical exercise of political power, is the doctrine that the structure of our government should be in fact, if not in form, assimilated as nearly as possible to that of such parliamentary governments as the British, in which the wielder of executive power is also charged with the functions of directing legislation and of determining party policy.

In putting this theory into practice, Mr. Wilson has had the advantage of exceptional personal qualities on his own part, and in no small measure also of the absence or extreme scarcity of qualities to match them on the part of the membership of Congress. The consequence has been that it has sometimes seemed almost as though he were controlling the actions of that body, not so much after the fashion of the leader of a representative assembly as of a man who holds the strings to which a set of puppets are bound to dance. This was singularly illustrated in the curious history of the armed-ship imbroglio, when, indeed, the dancing was extremely confused, but yet the result, though incoherent and unintelligible, was, in the rough, what the President wanted. However, it would be a mistake to suppose that the power in question, even in the hands of such a master as Wilson, is without its limitations. Indeed, a quick realization of its limitations is one of his prime resources in its management. Only this can account for his unhesitating throwing over of Secretary Garrison's programme of army organization, to which the President had been deeply enough committed, and the abandonment of which caused Mr. Garrison to resign in disgust.

While Mr. Wilson always has in mind the idea of assuming for the Presidency, so far as circumstances permit, such power over legislation as that exercised by a British Prime Minister, it may be doubted whether he is equally alive to the bearing of the conditions to which the latter power is obliged to conform. A British Prime Minister must submit his proposals to a Parliament whose rejection of them means the imminent risk of his own downfall. The President of the United States has a hold upon his office which nothing can shake until the close of a fixed term of years. This has a double effect upon the situation; it means, first, that success is far more probable, irrespective of the actual preference of Congress, since Congressmen know that the seat of power will continue where it is; and secondly it means that failure is not final. The passage of the Government Shipping bill is an illustration of what can be accomplished by that unflagging persistence in which Mr. Wilson—when he chooses—is unsurpassed. No man has made so many violent changes of position and opinion with such utter nonchalance; and no man has shown more dogged determination in matters upon which his heart is firmly set. Alike for the good and the bad that is in him, for sagacity and for shortsightedness, for resolution and for opportunism, the record of Mr. Wilson's dealings with Congress is quite as illuminating as that of his exercise of strictly executive functions.

GERMANY THE FORTRESS SMASHER.

An armored fortress taken on the rush and a bag of 20,000 prisoners will recall to Germans the great days of Namur and Novogeorgievsk. The heavy guns that began the symphony at Liège are still in good voice at Tutrakan. The effect of the Rumanian defeat on public opinion in Germany is self-evident. Another enemy has risen to challenge German might, and has met with swift payment for his folly. The sharp, dramatic victories in this war have been nearly all on Germany's side. We know that the fate of the war was decided at the Marne, and one cannot even at this date read the story of that battle without awe and tremor. But it took long months for the battle of the Marne to be told and for its results to be comprehended. There was no evident German disaster at the Marne, no great harvest of prisoners, no heavy capture of guns. Whereas German victories have so often shown an immediate profit in the form of great fortresses, hundreds of heavy guns, huge masses of prisoners, like those of Von Hindenburg in the Mazurian Lakes. The German people is not altogether deceived by its Government. Those dramatic victories must go far to keep up the belief in ultimate victory, even though the thundering prelude never seems to lead to the expected climax and the rapturous finale.

But if the latest tale of a great fortress taken by "storm," that is, by artillery fire, is bound to be put forth by the General Staff as another proof of Teuton invincibility, one cannot help wondering whether in the minds of this same General Staff and of the War Lord himself there is not a stirring of doubts and regrets that go back to the beginning of the war. Was the fundamental conception of the German campaign against France an error? Was the march through Belgium with all its enormous consequences necessary? The reasons for the invasion of Belgium were two. One was the supposed fact that the road to France from Germany direct was barred by the fortress chain from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Verdun down to Belfort. The other reason was Germany's desire for a huge Sedan to be obtained by an encircling movement through Belgium. The destruction of a fortress barrier calls for heavy guns. Germany had the guns, but apparently she did not herself realize in advance their full capacity. The encircling of an army of two million men calls for the highest kind of generalship. Germany thought she had the generalship, but events showed she had not. In other words, the Kaiser began the war by playing what turned out to be his weaker cards. His generals were outguessed by Joffre. His heavy guns, at any rate until quite recently, have had the advantage over the Allies.

It is idle but fascinating speculation as to what would have happened if Germany had hurled her heavy guns and masses along the Alsace-Lorraine frontier against the French barrier fortress. What reason is there to suppose that the old-fashioned fortresses at Verdun, Toul, Epinal, and Belfort would have held out against the forty-two centimetres any longer than Liège, Namur, or Maubeuge? Let it be recalled that in the French war scheme this fortress barrier was not counted upon as a permanent line of defence. It was intended simply to hold back the enemy while the French armies mobilized and concentrated. But if these forts had gone down in days instead of weeks, as the French Staff must have expected at the very least, the concentration of the French armies might have been prevented. Germany would have broken through between centre and tackle on both sides and "smeared" the enemy's play. Or if the French army were not beaten, there would still have been the opportunity to set the Sedan machinery into motion by following exactly in Moltke's steps. In 1870 Sedan was obtained by forcing the French army northward away from Paris to the Belgian frontier. In 1914 Germany set out to force the French army back upon Paris from the north, and towards Joffre's own centres of recruitment and reserve which he used so well.

This leaves out of consideration the different aspect the war might have assumed if not for the attack on Belgium. Say that England would have found a pretext other than Belgium for intervening. That intervention would have been delayed by valuable days, and the English expeditionary army, instead of going up to Mons, would have had to take the much longer route to the plains of Champagne. How different would have been the state of opinion in neutral countries, how different might even have been that factor of American ammunitions to which Germany sullenly attributes so much of her troubles, it is hardly necessary to state.

THE EMPIRE WITH A PENCIL.

Uncle Sam's support being purchased, in the last resort, by the cession of Canada.—Maximilian Harden.

The German people have been fond of describing themselves as passionately in love with reality. They are not. The war has made splinters of their *Realpolitik* and shown them up for incorrigible visionaries. The enemies of Germany have been sneering at the Kaiser's people as a nation of grubbers and cataloguers. This is not true. Germany is the wild-eyed stranger with a pencil and a piece of paper who asks only three minutes of your time to demonstrate the invasion of California by an army of five million Chinese under the leadership of the Mikado. The man with the pencil plays with races and continents and alliances and social revolutions. He shakes an Alaska-Cape Horn railway from his sleeve. He pulls Government ownership of the coal mines out of his vest pocket. He is own brother to Maximilian Harden, who, in a short parenthesis, brings Canada under the Stars and Stripes. He is kin to the learned, fantastic Germans who pull out a large-scale map and play Manifest Destiny; showing, for instance, how the configuration of the valley of the Euphrates spells the doom of English rule in India; how the predominant Gallo-Latin element in the south of France, striving against the predominant Gallo-Teuton element in the north of France, means national eclipse; and how the interaction of the gulf stream and the trade winds brings South America within the sphere of European domination to the exclusion of the United States. Herr Harden looks at a map and cedes Canada to the United States. What has been going on in Canada and the United States in the last twenty years does not matter to the man with a pencil.

Decadent France, that was destined to crumple up under the first blow from the German fist; shopkeeping, hypocritical England, that would egg on France to war and leave her in the lurch; uncivilized and unorganized Russia, that could not possibly endure more than six months of war; French anti-militarists ready to raise barricades in the streets of Paris; Russian revolutionaries prepared to march on the Winter Palace; British trade-unionists refusing to back up a war; Celtic Ireland rising as a man against Saxon domination—these are only a few of the tragi-comic calculations of the Empire with a pencil. That busy little bit of lead had no difficulty in demonstrating that the Pan-Islamic world would rise against England the tyrant of Egypt, Russia the spoliator of Persia, Italy for her seizure of Tripoli, and France for her seizure of Morocco; only, somehow or other, the Pan-Islamic world did not rise, and the Grand Sherif of the holy city of Mecca has declared war against the Caliph at Constantinople. It is true that the man with a pencil has been busy on the other side. Many a calculation by an Allied amateur has gone astray. But Allied calculations have been, as we have said, amateur. They have lacked the cosmic conclusiveness of the German crayon work. They have been put forward frankly as the expression of a hope or a desire rather than as the operation of the on-and-on striving and by-the-law-of-its-own-nature-determined course of historic evolution so prolifically made in Germany.

The difference between the man with a pencil on the 7:59 local and the German Empire is that the former has no footnotes, glossary, general introduction, and appendix; no scholarship and methodology in other words. But the outcome is the same. The commuter with a pencil will sometimes insist, in curt fashion, that 2 times 2 is 5. German scholarship will say, on such occasions: "If we look upon the numeral 2 not as 2, but only as the convenient expression of the square root of 2 multiplied by the square root of 2, then it is to be seen that, under the circumstances we have in mind, the square of the square root of 2 multiplied by the square of the square root of 2 will equal 5." The commuter with a pencil will point out to you the danger to Western civilization from modern forces, operating among 900,000,000 Chinese; whereas we know that there are only about 400,000,000 Chinese. The Houston Stewart Chamberlain school of German scholarship and logic will say: "As Johannes Funkelstern has shown in his epoch-making investigations on 'Blood Tests and Nervous Reactions Among the Chinese,' published in the *Jahrbücher der phantastischen Wissenschaften*, Leipzig, 1911-13, *passim*, the productive energy capable of being developed by the average Chinese peasant is equal to 2¼ times the latent energy of the European farmer. It is therefore only necessary to multiply 400,000,000 Chinamen by 2¼ to see how inevitable is the time when the Western world will be confronted by the power of an armed China of nine hundred million men."

For all its minute scholarship and vast

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

apparatus of psychological research, Germany is the man with the pencil who can prove anything. With an overwhelming mobilization of geographical detail the German savant can show you how inevitable it was that a great civilization should have arisen in the rich river-valleys of the Nile and Euphrates. He can also show you how inevitable it was that a civilization should have arisen on the table-land of Irak, on the mountain tops of Peru, and in the fastnesses of the Turkestan desert. He can show you how the Norman invasion inevitably fertilized the English nation, and how the Tartar invasion inevitably sterilized the Russian nation. Scholars all the world over have that trick; but it has been brought to perfection in the country of Maximilian Harden and Houston Stewart Chamberlain.

Foreign Correspondence

THE BIGNESS AND THE LITTLENESS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

By SIR HENRY LUCY.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, August 19.

It has been said that the elephant, in respect to his capacity to uproot with his trunk a forest tree or with it to pick up a pin, bears close resemblance to the House of Commons. The comparison is apt. It may be added that of the two exercises the House prefers pin-picking. A striking illustration of this familiar tendency was provided this week. The demon of war is abroad in the land. We can almost hear the thunder of its guns on the banks of the Somme. The House, playing the larger part in common with the elephant, has, to meet the charges of the war, raised revenues hitherto fabulous in amount. It has devoted its manhood to carry on the Titanic conflict. Determined finally to uproot the upas tree of German militarism, it will haggle over no expense of blood or money to achieve its righteous purpose. On a day this week it happened that, superadded to the cares pertaining to this resolution, was the duty of dealing with the important home questions of further prolongation of the life of Parliament and revision of the Register in anticipation of an inevitable general election.

On approach to this augmented business of supreme urgency the member for East Aberdeenshire was discovered standing in the gangway by the corner seat of the fourth Bench, in which the member for East Edinburgh reposed with ostentatiously far-away look. He was flagrantly out of order. As sacred as the Bill of Rights is prohibition of a member attempting to address the Chair from the gangway. In response to angry shouts of "Order! order!" Mr. Cowan told a touching story. Early in the morning he had entered the House and placed on the seat now occupied by Mr. Hogge a card signifying appropriation. That was a preliminary proceeding, equivalent to pegging out a claim on a newly discovered gold field. In accordance with regulation governing the case, he was, later, present at prayers, and inserted a name-card in the slot at the back of the bench. Everything being done to secure possession of a seat whence he might comfortably attend the important debate arranged, he strolled off to the lobby. On returning after ten minutes' absence he found Mr. Hogge in the seat. What was more disturbing, he refused to get out of it. Hence, on the principle with which despairing men sometimes break a shop window in order to call public attention to an act of injustice under which they smart, Mr. Cowan stood in the gangway and proposed to offer a few remarks.

The incident—whose development was watched with avid interest by a House forgetful for a moment of the war raging on four battle-fronts, of a five-shilling-in-the-pound income tax, and of the urgent necessity of conserving the rights of Parliamentary voters in arms on sea or land—illustrates one of several quaint customs observed by the Mother of Parliaments. In most legislative chambers founded upon her procedure and precedents, members have seats individually allotted to them. The House of Representatives at Washington, for example, is furnished with comfortable armchairs conveniently fitted with revolving apparatus, so that a member, beginning to be bored with one point of view, may turn round and survey another. Also he has a desk all his own, in which he may keep his private papers. In the Hungarian Parliament the desks of members upon occasion play a leading part in a debate. When a Minister makes a statement not wholly satisfactory to representatives of one of the several nationalities that grudgingly own the sway of the Austrian Emperor, they in unison uplift the lid of their desk and bring it down with a bang.

Members of the House of Commons have no desk, nor, with the exception of the two front benches, is there recognized prescriptive right to a particular seat. The cumbrous, inconvenient method of obtaining a seat is indicated in the tussle between the two Scotch representatives named. A member urgently desirous of obtaining a seat for a particular debate must needs be up bright and early to peg out his claim. Formerly this was done by placing the hat on the coveted seat. It is on record in a veracious chronicle that in anticipation of Mr. Gladstone bringing in his first Home Rule bill that matured statesman, the present Secretary of State for India (Mr. Chamberlain), arrived at break of day in Palace Yard with a four-wheeler filled with top hats. These he managed by a succession of journeys to convey to the House of Commons, planting them out like cabbages on a back bench below the gangway, then occupied by the leaders of the newly born Dissentient Liberal party.

The hat thus placed on a particular seat served a double purpose. It asserted a claim, and apparently testified to the owner's observance of the rule that it was valid only in the case of members who remained within the building up to prayer-time, when, by their attendance, and only then, they may complete the links of procedure by placing a name-card in the slot at the back of the bench. There grew up and rapidly spread a custom with members of possessing themselves of two hats, one marking out a claim to a seat, the other, known as the business hat, serving their purpose in wandering abroad. Discovery of this plot led to the institution of the large card now in use. Mr. Hogge's fatal omission, which led to his eviction from the corner seat and the triumphant instalment of Mr. Cowan, was his absence from prayers. His defeat has had salutary result in increased regularity of devotional habit.

THE DYING OF INTERNATIONALISM.

By STODDARD DEWEY.

PARIS, August 26.

The death-gasps of the various internationalisms of peace time are proper news items of the war. The opinions of a single man, unless he should happen to be a man of recognized authority, would be of little account. It is the news and the succession of news, week by week, which must tell in such matters.

Before the smoke of war clouded universal vision there were three, if not five, internationalisms at work among peoples of European civilization, and particularly in France. The Roman Catholic Church was the oldest, centuries old, and the world is accustomed to its taking care of itself in all nations and weathers. Socialism in its international form has scarcely a half-century's existence, and it has been identified commonly with revolution. Pacifism was negative, but it had its usual curious recrudescence before wars.

The other spiritual movements common to civilized nations had no proper internationalism. Protestantism as such is negative and strongly national, even in its efforts to convert Roman Catholics. Free-masonry, under all its secrecy, when it became political, was unavoidably national, and historically was little more than the complementary color of Roman Catholicism, while of late years, in France at least, it showed increasing uneasiness towards Socialism, which was more than taking its place. Jewish thought and sentiment, when extended to other objects than its own cosmopolitan rather than international race, was national, or, at most, identified itself with Freemasonry or Socialism.

In France Protestant, Freemason, and Jewish movements embraced no great number of citizens, although their activity was often disproportionate to their number. Outward commotion as well as numbers marked three internationalisms, and no more—Catholicism, Socialism, and, lagging far behind, Pacifism. Of these, Pacifism, which can only exist internationally, is dying as a result of the fact of war. Catholicism and Socialism do not need the international life, which war has weakened; and it is probable each has gained nationally, though perhaps not politically.

All this may seem systematic, but it is little more than an obvious classification of spiritual movements as they have manifested themselves publicly in France during the war. The Internationale, in which a persistent attempt had been made to centre all national Socialisms, is the most edifying example.

The August session of the National Council of the French Socialist party only repeats and reëmphasizes the decisions of last April and last year. Two-thirds of the members vote solidly against resuming relations of any kind with the German Sozial-Demokratie until German Socialists repudiate and reprove their complicity with Prussian Militarists and German Imperialists. The majority of the remaining third follows Jean Longuet, a French grandson of the German founder of the Internationale, Karl Marx, in demanding that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relations shall be resumed as a matter of course with German branches of the Internationale—after the war. The small minority groups itself around three French Deputies, who already, but as non-committally as possible, have met with German Socialists at Kienthal, in neutral Switzerland, with a view to international discussions. Like the two Syndicalists who sat at Zimmerwald last year in a similar international conventicle, they had no mandate from their party or Federation, and their action has been officially repudiated.

It is important that publicity should be given to what might otherwise be thought a tempest in the French Socialist teapot. The pro-German propaganda in neutral countries tries persistently to accredit the legend that French Socialists, who for the occasion are taken as representing the French People (with a big P), are on the point of breaking away from the Union Sacrée, which makes all France fight as one man against Germany. German Socialists labor under no such delusion, for they have formally recognized, during the past week, that there is nothing to be done with French Socialists in or out of the Internationale. At the Hague Conference of Neutral Internationalists, held the week before, where the guiding spirit was the pro-German Troelstra, of Holland, the Swedish delegates forced a vote repudiating German Imperialist and Militarist action, at least in Belgium and France, and demanding that Alsace-Lorraine should be a subject of discussion.

The apparent dissension, so far as it goes, in the French Socialist party is due to a piece of reasoning. "You cannot have an Internationale which excludes a whole set of nationalities." One of the three "Kienthalists," Alexandre Blanc, reduces it to a question of consistency: "You cannot put your peace programme in your pocket just because you are at war." The heir of Karl Marx seems to add: "The temporary interruption of war should not be allowed to divert Socialists from the perennial purpose which gives them a right to existence—the conflict of classes, the struggle of labor against capital, in all nations—for this alone and everywhere is international and survives all nationalism."

After the other war between Germany and France, and after the Paris Commune, which was rather a manifestation of exasperated nationalism, the original Internationale foundered, recovered, and split finally into the Collectivism of Karl Marx, who would govern everything, and Bakunin's anarchy, which would do away with all government. It is easy to foresee that, after this war, the recovery of internationalism of every kind will be far more difficult. Labor against capital may endure, but the Internationale already gasps for life.

The case is somewhat different for Catholicism. The religion, which is international essentially, has received increase of life in the warring nations for reasons often explained, easily understood, and verified in known facts. The Church, which is religion organized, has also increased its strength in its national organization, at least in France and Belgium.

In Germany, at the very beginning of war, the Bishop of Paderborn warned his brethren that their complicity in militarist accusations against the Belgian clergy might end in Protestant opposition to themselves at home. The fear of a Kulturkampf, to which that of Bismarck after the other war would be child's play, has not deterred German Catholics, particularly in their political organization, from pursuing such a policy. As the Belgian bishops have proclaimed to the world, this policy brings in guilty of perjury the entire clergy of a nation like Belgium, which has come as near as is possible in the present state of the world to being a Catholic nation. Cardinal Hartmann, Archbishop of Cologne, within the past month has identified himself with this policy, consenting to be made the messenger of the German Emperor's defence with the Pope for wholesale deportation of thousands of French men and young girls torn from their families without notice—a defence which would give the lie to the tragic protests of French bishops.

The case of the Pope is different. Neither French nor Belgian Catholics, in spite of their sufferings in their clergy and their religion, have once criticised Benedict the Fifteenth's great reserve. They understand that it is imposed by the fact that his authority is international. Individual Catholics in neutral nations have been more alarmed. This is probably the reason of the late address of sympathy with France and Belgium signed by the most eminent laymen of Spain.

It is a curious fact, which may be explained after the war, that the Catholic clergy of neutral nations should so persistently have held aloof from their suffering brethren of France and Belgium. French missionary priests and teaching brothers and sisters have always worked to spread their religion in all lands, without hope of any return to France; and they, at least, have never been reproached with being not so much missionaries as colonizers. It is often their spiritual children who adopt this enigmatic attitude. In any event, direct international relations among Catholics of the various belligerent nations seem prospectively to be very much like those among Socialists, who also have pretensions to world-religion.

Notes from the Capital

FRANK HARRIS HITCHCOCK.

The report that Frank Harris Hitchcock might have been named for the position now filled by William R. Willcox as conductor-in-chief of the Hughes campaign, but spoiled his chances by talking too much, lays a severe tax upon the credulity of any one who knows Mr. Hitchcock. He has always had among his friends a reputation for keeping his own counsel with a strictness which is occasionally disconcerting to them. That, though not captain, he is at least to be first lieutenant in the war now on, indicates that Mr. Hughes realizes his practical value and cherishes no grudge for his premature candor. As for Hitchcock, he probably takes all the discussion of him as part of the day's work, for he has seen a little of the "downs" as well as much of the "ups" of public life since he first addressed himself to it in a humble way. He made his bow in Washington during the early nineties, when, fresh from Harvard, he entered the clerical service of the Government. Gen. Nettleton, who was an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in Harrison's Administration, was a near relative, and took an interest in seeing him properly placed; but the young man had barely mastered the vocabulary of his office in the Statistical Bureau of the Department of Agriculture when that champing war-horse of Reform, Julius Sterling Morton, was let loose upon the Department by Cleveland, and began to make life pleasant for whoever got in his way. It was not long before Morton scented the relationship of Hitchcock with a former Republican magnate, and drove him out into the cold world.

He did not remain in exile for any considerable period, for one of his old friends who was on agreeable terms with Morton got the old gentleman's ear and filled it with facts about Hitchcock's uncommonly fine record in college. That was the sort of thing that appealed to Morton, who presently decided to call his victim back, try him at a new line of work, and discover by personal observation whether he was really worth keeping, instead of accepting too readily the off-hand opinion of ultra-partisan advisers. The experiment proved a distinct success. Hitchcock entered the Division of Foreign Markets, and soon showed a grasp of the work which warmed the heart of the Secretary, who promoted him to be chief of the division, and on one occasion sent him abroad on a special errand of importance. While he was still working at this post, Roosevelt succeeded to the Presidency, and, on the establishment of the Department of Commerce and Labor, put George B. Cortelyou at the head of it.

Now, it so happened that Cortelyou had been for several years a Government stenographer in Washington, and had seen a good deal of Hitchcock there, especially while they both were putting in their spare hours studying for the bar at a local law school; so he promptly called in his friend to be his chief clerk. From that point Hitchcock's rise was fairly rapid. He made such a mark as an organizer and manager that he was placed upon the Keep Commission for investigating the methods of the departments and recommending measures for their improvement in efficiency and economy; and when Cortelyou was made Postmaster-General Hitchcock was summoned over to become his First Assistant. The management of Taft's first campaign was turned over to him, and he carried it through to victory. Then he served his full four years as Postmaster-General, laid the keel of the parcel post and launched the postal-savings systems, superintended sweeping inclusions of fourth-class postmasters in the classified civil service, went down with the rest of the Taft outfit in the disaster of 1912, and came to the surface again as a New York lawyer.

Tall, slender, good-looking, light-complexioned, with flaxen hair that lies flat and straight wherever the brush plants it, Hitchcock is a noticeable figure in any assemblage. He is pleasant-mannered without any affectation of cordiality; indeed, his approach suggests a shy rather than a forward disposition. Though Ohio-born and an habitual office-holder, he will never be found slapping comparative strangers on the back as an evidence of his delight at meeting them, or throwing his arm around the neck of an older acquaintance for affability's sake. He has none of the conventional tricks of the political puller-in. With him politics is a serious business rather than a social game, but what he lacks in effervescence of demeanor he makes up by a faithful memory of names and faces, and he knows the whole country so well now that he can talk to almost any man from a distance whom he meets about the most important affairs going on at home.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Just what influences have combined to keep him a bachelor at forty-seven, the gossips have given up guessing. True, he is not the type of man to attract the languishing style of damsels, but how he has escaped heart-free from the kind with practical ideas and solid charms is a mystery. It may be that his half-shy air means more than any of us have suspected. But then—there's leap-year.

TATTLER.

Woodrow Wilson

THE PRESIDENT'S POLICIES ANALYZED IN THE LIGHT OF HIS NATURAL INHIBITIONS AND HIS PAST RECORD.

By A NEUTRAL.

Mystery is always a political asset in the early days of the encumbency of a man holding high office. The reputation of being "genial," "a good mixer," "a home-lover," "devoted to his family," stands a man in good stead so long as he is a candidate, but after his election a new set of terms is needed. If none are immediately forthcoming, the terms "mystery," "enigma," "sphinx," "inscrutable," serve until the proper designations are developed. Nothing is simpler than to transfer our own inabilty to understand a person to his inability to be understood—call a man a "mystery" when we fail to understand him and the trick is turned.

Woodrow Wilson, from the election in November to his inauguration, profited much by this reputation for being inscrutable: it seemed to connote profound political wisdom, prophetic insight, and a firm grasp of the unknown and unknowable. Very quickly, however, the new terms were developed, and this not alone by his political opponents. These terms were "obstinate," "dragoon," "vacillating," "weak," "theorist," and other designations forming an exceptionally long list of epithets derogatory and apparently contradictory. Yet, so far from being an enigma, no man was ever more easily understood than is Woodrow Wilson, the key to the combination being given.

What is Woodrow Wilson's political creed and how far does this creed qualify him for holding the chief executive office of this country? As a young man, he once quoted a statement to the effect that every man was fundamentally controlled by one principle, or, to change the figure, had a keynote: Gladstone, for example, whether arranging a budget, writing about Homer, or attending a high-church convocation, was fundamentally a statesman, and his apparent versatility but variations from the keynote.

Woodrow Wilson's political keynote is the union of legislative and executive functions of government, with the Legislature the active partner. Probably no man has ever come into the Presidency who has had so clearly defined a political creed, so definite a programme, as he has had. From the time of "Congressional Government," everything that he has written in regard to government has centred on the legislative department of it. Almost alone of our Chief Executives he has clearly recognized the essential differences in the two departments, he has realized that it is largely to the legislative department that constructive policies belong, and he has sought to ally himself with that in order to accomplish what he believes good government has demanded. His interest in legislation has, moreover, not only been clearly defined, but it has been restricted to the very narrow field of legislation looking towards improving the machinery of government.

In his speech accepting the nomination for the Governorship of New Jersey, the points he emphasized were first the conventional one stated by all candidates of all parties, "the business-like and economical administration of the business of the State"; but with this out of the way, he enumerated equalization of taxes, control of corporations, a corrupt-practices act, liability of employers, and conservation—all matters of legislative, not executive, action. And he goes on to say: "We have got to reconstruct a new economic society, and in doing so we will have to directly govern political methods." But the reconstruction of a new economic society is a matter of legislation, not of executive action. In all of his speeches he returns again and again to legislative action as the *causa causans* of a better life in State and nation—"we must change the law," "we want legislation in the general interests," "it is through them [State Legislatures] that we attempt all the more intimate measures of self-government." "He believes in turning the hose of public opinion on the Legislature through executive leadership," is the somewhat realistic way of expressing the idea used by one of his admirers.

This explains his advocacy of the short ballot, direct primary, initiative and referendum, commission government, honest election laws, extension of the primary laws—of every measure for improving the machinery of government. It also explains his statement that he is an organization man: "If an organization is privately owned, I am not for it. If, on the other hand, it is used as a means of expressing the views of the people, I am certainly in favor of it."

It is not evident that he has any real interest in matters of general legislation apart from those that concern improvement in the machinery of government. The only Federal legislation in which he has shown a genuine interest has been that involving a change and an improvement in governmental machinery, as in the creation of the Federal Reserve Board. That the positions created by this act were apparently filled with greater care than was given to other appointments was due to the interest taken in a bill that was ranked as an Administration measure.

Woodrow Wilson has been described as being deeply aroused by the failure of representative government to represent the people, and the remedy he sees for this failure is executive leadership: "The whole country, since it cannot decipher the methods of its legislation, is clamoring for leadership; and a new rôle is thrust upon our executives." Leadership has for at least thirty years been his aim, and he has never varied from it by a hair's breadth. But leadership implies persons willing to be led, and it is here that the theory of leadership as a political method breaks down. This defect it shares with all altruistic reforms. *Non ministrari sed ministrare* leaves one-half the world without the opportunity of serving, if they are to be served by the other half. In order that one-half of the world may secure the blessings of service, these blessings must be denied to the other half. Woodrow Wilson can have heard but a very faint clamor from people desiring leadership, while the new note of coöperation he has not yet heard.

This may seem to savor of the political boss, but the resemblance is only superficial. The political boss is an executive officer—he makes slates, manages a press bureau, collects and distributes campaign funds, and is pastmaster of the art of checkmating the king. The boss is always on the job, a veritable busybody running hither and thither, but his work is in no sense of the word constructive. All of his business is absolutely abhorrent to Woodrow Wilson, and his antipathy to the boss is intensified by his impatience with all positions that call for routine executive work, and by his own ambition for genuine legislative leadership.

The obverse and the reverse side of the political shield are the need of changing the laws and the need of executive leadership in making these changes—this is the alpha and omega of Woodrow Wilson's political, social, and industrial creed. It is absolutely simple, and by this creed all of his public career may be tested.

As president of Princeton, as Governor of New Jersey, as President of the United States, he has attempted to be a legislative leader, while in every case he has been chosen as an executive head. This is the simple explanation of the friction that has inevitably arisen in each of the three executive positions he has filled. In each case he has stepped aside from the thing he was chosen to do, and has elected to do a thing somewhat foreign to our method of thought and action. At Princeton, differences with the alumni arose because he wished to control legislation that altered the machinery of academic life for the undergraduate, and differences arose with the faculty because he wished to control legislation that altered the machinery of life for graduate students. Much of the work with which his name was identified at Princeton, as the establishment of the preceptorial system, was of a purely legislative character.

His academic and political controversies have been ascribed to his desire to champion the cause of democracy against the encroachment of privilege. But democracy as a mode of life is of less interest to him than democracy as a political expedient, and both as a political expedient and as an abstract

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theory it has no more interest for him than has representative government.

His election to the Presidency he regarded as an opportunity for carrying out certain personal theories in regard to the Government; of the larger opportunities of the position he has been simply oblivious. Thus he has always shown a courteous impatience with everything that stands in the way of carrying out his own carefully planned measures. To the interests and welfare of Belgium and of Mexico he has been alike indifferent; the settlement of the vital questions affecting the very life of each country has not interested him, and he has been quite willing to turn over Mexico to his "personal representative"—a native of Sweden—in absolute unconsciousness of the incongruity of such an appointment, and to pursue a course of "watchful waiting" in regard to Belgium when instant action might have saved a nation's life. It is as idle to upbraid Woodrow Wilson for not doing otherwise than he has done as it is to blame a man who has made an automobile for not making an aeroplane. Foreign nations have for him simply not existed. If ever this country has produced a pure unhyphenated American, it is Woodrow Wilson. The type of Americanism is different from that of Mr. Bryan, but it is even more extreme. Mr. Bryan's Americanism is one of comparison —Americans are the finest people in the world. President Wilson's Americanism is one of isolation—other nations do not exist. Scarcely a word or phrase, prior to his election to the Presidency, gives any indication that he knew of the existence of any country outside of America; and he was, therefore, as Chief Executive, confronted by a situation the very existence of which he had apparently never realized.

The civil service has come to be a somewhat perfunctory matter—we expect every President "to do something for it," while not forgetting our district in the distribution of Federal offices; to reach out his front hand to the extension of the service, and to hold in his back hand a fat office. But the same indifference has attended the administration of the civil service as has been the fate of our foreign policy. The individual cases of directors of various bureaus, special ambassadors and consuls, postmasters, and collectors may in themselves matter little, but the principle underlying all these cases matters immeasurably. In the pre-Wilson days, a commuter who read six below zero on his thermometer and "rain before night" in his morning paper carried his umbrella when he left home and needed it on his return. "Pernicious political activity" always stands in good stead as a reason for vacating an office, and the change in the headship of the Weather Bureau was apparently a matter of indifference to the President. To commuters and to all persons whose occupation is conditioned by the weather, it was as much a matter of indifference whether the head of the Weather Bureau was a Democrat or a Republican, or had been guilty of real or alleged "pernicious political activity," as were the color of his eyes and the shape of his head. The commuter wanted to know whether he ought to carry his umbrella and the farmer whether he should hurry in the hay. "A business administration" is as good a political talisman for getting a new man into office as "pernicious political activity" is a good excuse for putting an experienced man out of office. Hence an efficient, trained statistician was supplanted as head of the Census Bureau by a "business man"; in other words, by the Wilson campaign manager in Georgia. But what persons whose interests demand the frequent use of statistics wish to know is whether the facts put before them are absolutely unimpeachable rather than who carried Georgia for the Democrats.

The President is condemned for his wanton dismissal of officials and his indifference to the qualification of their successors, yet it is as reasonable to condemn a color-blind signalman for allowing a train to pass when the danger signals are set. He is blamed for not extending and strengthening civil service reform, but to impute blame to him on that score is much the same as blaming a tone-deaf man for not conducting well a symphony orchestra.

It is idle to condemn him for the inroads made on the civil service, for changing front on the preparedness question, for inconsistency in supporting a Federal child labor law and opposing a Federal equal suffrage amendment, for a devious policy in regard to Mexico, for weakness and vacillation in all of our foreign intercourse—all this is as unreasonable as it is to criticise a man for not spending his time in building a house when he is otherwise engaged in the, to him, more congenial task of trying to run a submarine or an aeroplane. His apparent vacillation comes from no desire to play small politics and win votes, though this is an easy way of explaining his frequent change of front. It is due entirely to his indifference to the failure or the success of measures in which he is personally not interested. He has probably no genuine personal interest in the Child Labor bill, but if its passage will clear the decks for the passage of other measures in which he is interested, let it pass. Probably he has no special interest in equal suffrage, no more after having voted for it than he had thirty years ago when he did not know of the existence of the question—let it pass. His change from opposition to increased military expenditure to zealous promotion of it is explained less by a desire to win votes than by an indifference to the whole question; it really does not matter one way or another.

It is clearly evident from innumerable passages from Woodrow Wilson's writings and from his entire public career that his shortcomings in executive office have been due solely to his fundamental belief that an executive officer of the traditional American type is never a leader, inasmuch as he but carries out plans formulated by a legislative body; that for purely excutive work he has had no desire, since such executive duties have been distasteful to him. He has had no interest in diplomacy, and he has been indifferent to the civil service. He has had little personal sympathy with individuals, he has found it difficult to get the point of view of the other man, and he has not always recognized the importance of getting this view. Much has been said, and the phrase was exploited at the time of the resignation of Secretary Bryan, about "the lonely man in the White House," yet it is difficult to conceive of Woodrow Wilson's being "lonely," in the sense of recognizing or regretting his isolation. The isolation of leadership has indeed always been to him a most congenial state. What he has found most irksome in the executive office has been the expectation that he would confer with others. This has made Cabinet meetings perfunctory, conferences with newspaper men lapse, and refusals to meet delegates seem to him virtuous.

The President has ignored the opportunities for constructive work afforded by the chief executive office as it is organized, yet these opportunities are far from inconsiderable. They are the ever widening and deepening ones of, first of all, the treaty-making power that involves all of our intercouse with every nation of the world. To the President is expressly given the initiative in this matter, and the opportunities for a great constructive, far-reaching policy are almost unthinkable. To the President is given the power of appointment; this, too, is of tremendous importance in the conduct of both foreign and domestic affairs. In the single matter of the post office, the number of offices has increased from 75 in 1789 to more than 56,000 in 1915, and to this must be added nearly 44,000 rural carriers. Consuls dot the face of the map of the world, and ministers and ambassadors are on all the high points. Federal judges, district attorneys, and marshals are found from Maine and Porto Rico to Hawaii and Alaska. The war powers of the President are far from inconsiderable. All of these powers and duties are expressly mandatory, and they are sufficient, it would seem, to fill the time and thought and give scope to the abilities of any man. The Constitution, moreover, does provide certain channels of communication between the executive and the legislative departments. Since the Senate must ratify treaties by a two-thirds vote and confirm appointments by a majority vote, it would seem as if this connection with one branch of the legislative body would give the President much opportunity to exercise the desired leadership, but this has apparently seemed small game.

The President has deliberately turned his back on all these opportunities, or, rather, he has seen none of them, and has chosen to give his energies to that part of the duties of the office that is suspended in mid-air—the President "shall, from time to time, give to the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." But Congress is not compelled to consider these measures or to act on these recommendations—in fact, it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prefers to lay them on the table and to act on information received from other sources. If the President and Congress happen to be of opposite political parties, the information given by the President may lead to open hostility between the two departments of government.

The result of all this desire for leadership on the part of the President has been that, while he has mapped out work for Congress, Congress has looked after his work. There has always been the tendency in this direction—the germ from which it has developed is in the Constitution itself—but under President Wilson it has flourished like a banyan tree. While he is planning legislative work, the members of Congress are equally busy in planning to circumvent him, especially in nominations and appointments. Mr. Brandeis's name was sent to the Senate in January, but was not confirmed until June 1. In the interval, an elaborate inquiry had been carried on, practically involving the entire country, as to the qualifications of Mr. Brandeis for the position to which President Wilson had nominated him.

"Nearly every Ministry begins to die soon after its birth," says Sir Edward Cook in his "Delane of the *Times*." The bitterness of the criticism with which Woodrow Wilson has been attacked almost from the outset of his Administration can only in part be explained by this general tendency. It is in large measure due to the failure of others to understand his political theory and his political practice as based upon it.

There is much to be said for a plan of government that unites legislative and executive functions. Our theory of checks and balances, based on the assumption that no man in office could be trusted, has repeatedly and inevitably broken down in theory and in practice. But, however much may be said in favor of this plan, even those most desirous of seeing it inaugurated have been the first to recognize that the time for trying it has been inauspicious—and this for reasons lying entirely outside of either Executive or Legislature. The question is not at all whether the plan is "un-American" or not. Nor is the question at all whether leadership in legislation is a wise method of governing or not. It may be, probably is, an altogether admirable method, but if we have never been accustomed to such leadership in the national Government, if it has been foreign to our thinking in our State governments, if there has been more or less of a prejudice against it, granting that the prejudice is founded on ignorance, more is needed to accustom a people to the change, to secure their acquiescence in it, than the simple putting it into operation without preliminary announcement.

It has been the irony of fate that the only President in office who has had the keenest interest in developing new and improved relations between Executive and Legislature on the executive side should almost from his first day in office have been confronted with purely executive problems in which he has had no interest, and this from circumstances lying entirely outside of Executive, Congress, the nation itself. It has been simply a case of the round peg in the square hole. Given normal conditions, we should have had important domestic legislation, marked improvement in the workings of governmental machinery—matters where great improvement has been sorely needed. Given abnormal conditions, where the importance of domestic questions has been subordinated to those of foreign policy in all of its multifarious foreign and domestic ramifications, and it has been plainly a case of misfit. For this misfit the electors have only their own ignorance, indifference, and carelessness to thank.

It is often said that Woodrow Wilson was unknown before coming into the Presidency. But this is true only in a very restricted sense. We could have known all about him if we had taken the trouble to inquire, in other words, if we had read his books and applied to his probable career in the Presidency the political theory found on every page of his published writings, and if we had examined the application of his theory to the executive positions previously held. This we did not do. The result is that, having elected him on general principles, we complain because in important details he has not measured up to our ideas, subsequently acquired, of what we have thought he ought to do, although he has filled the office quite in harmony with all of his published writings on the subject and quite in harmony with the way in which he filled the two executive offices previously held.

Would it be reasonable in our selection of a President to inquire what are his qualifications for the chief executive office?

The popular idea of an executive as a leader is but a survival of the early idea of the military chief who sallied forth at the head of his men in search of adventure, or for conquest. But the modern executive is not a leader; he is, what the term itself implies, one who carries out to success plans formulated by others. This, however, has not been Woodrow Wilson's idea of an executive. Nor has his idea of an executive coincided with the idea of an executive held by Congress. The result is that confusion worse confounded seems inherent in all our governmental processes. We wish a change in tariff legislation, and we elect an executive officer whose views on the tariff agree with ours, forgetting that the making of tariffs is a legislative function. We aspire to be postmaster in our home town, or to represent the country as a foreign Minister, no matter where, and we forthwith campaign for the election to Congress of our leading citizen in the hope that in the event of his election he will "do something" for us, forgetting that nominations to executive positions belong to the President. Political misfits on the part of the electorate, the legislative body, and the Chief Executive have never been more in evidence than they have been the past three years. These misfits have been due to general thoughtlessness on the part of the electorate, to the bumptiousness of Congress, and to the effort of the President to put into effect a plan of government unfamiliar to the electorate and unacceptable to Congress. Is there any hope for a clarification of our political ideas save in the slow process of education?

There must have been a consciousness on the part of the President of how comparatively little he has been able to accomplish in the direction in which his chief interest lies, and it is undoubtedly this that has led to the desire for a second term in the hope that external conditions will so change as to make possible the achievement of this desired result of unifying executive and legislative action. The question at issue in the present campaign is, therefore, not that of the individual men, but of the widely different conception the two men probably hold of the nature of the executive office. Is there any indication that the President will change his fundamental conception of the nature of the executive office and of his personal relation to it, that inborn indifference to questions of foreign policy will be succeeded by an active interest in them, that improvements will be made in the civil service either in theory or in practice, that the President will be any more interested than in the past in getting the point of view of others and in coöperating with them? Probably not.

There are two ways of enlarging the horizon of one who stands at the centre of a circle; the entire horizon may be enlarged, or a single section may have its arc increased by the prolongation of its bounding radii. Woodrow Wilson's entire horizon has never been enlarged, a wider outlook has come only in a single direction, by the enlargement of a single arc—the direction of the radii has never changed. There has been, indeed, a certain pride in maintaining an attitude of aloofness. It has been a matter of boast that he had but once casually visited the House of Representatives before he wrote "Congressional Government," that he had never visited the Trenton Legislature before he was inaugurated Governor of New Jersey, that he had never entered the White House before he became President. There is a wide difference between selfishness and self-centredness. Woodrow Wilson would probably not consciously sacrifice any one else to reach his own ambition, and in this sense he has not been a selfish man. But he has always been intensely interested in his own career. He has never had a thought or desire of interfering with others, he has had no feeling that others stand in his way—he simply does not see others, and he is unconscious that others as well as himself may have an honest, justifiable ambition to carry out measures they believe will promote the public welfare. He is thus inherently a self-centred man. No better illustration of this personal characteristic can be given than a statement the present writer once heard him make to the effect that the best travelled man he knew had never been outside of Georgia.

In the coming election are we planning to elect an executive officer or a legislative leader? The present Administration has raised a new issue, and it must be met.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

"FORWARD-LOOKING" OR "OVERLOOKING."

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I have read with interest the letter by D. M. Deeg, "Supporting the President," in the *Nation* of August 31. He tells us that President Wilson "gave currency to the phrase 'forward looking.'" Has he not likewise given currency to the phrase "watchful waiting"? There are thousands upon thousands of American men and women in the United States, and thousands of voters, who believe with Professor Royce that the dead of the Lusitania are their dead. These same thousands wonder what of avenging their dead, their murdered, they may hope for, either from President Wilson's "forward looking" or from his "watchful waiting," if they support him for another term. The fear behind their wonder is simply this: Will his "watchful waiting" prove, as it has for more than a year now, to be only continued waiting? Will his "forward looking" continue to be overlooking? Alfred M. Brooks.

Gloucester, Mass., September 1.

MATHEMATICS IN THE HARVARD ENTRANCE EXAMINATION.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The Committee on Admissions of Harvard University has recently taken a step which in my opinion is not creditable to it and is very injurious to the cause of sound education in the United States. If the facts as reported to me are true, they should be known to all who are interested in raising the standard of education in this country, and be fully discussed by those who are interested in the intellectual welfare of our youth.

This year for the first time, Harvard, Yale, and Princeton gave up their own examinations and accepted those of the College Entrance Examination Board. Now it develops that Harvard is passing candidates in algebra, plane geometry, and solid geometry who have got a mark of over 40 per cent. but less than 50 in the recent examinations. The justification of this step reported to me is that it was taken on the recommendation of the Harvard department of mathematics. If that be so, it divides the blame between two committees, but does not lessen the discredit involved to our oldest university.

The reasons alleged are that the papers set by the C. E. E. B. were conspicuously unfair as regards these subjects and did not correspond with the requirements announced by the C. E. E. B. I do not see how any experienced teacher of mathematics can accept this excuse as sound for a moment. The papers in algebra and plane geometry were not hard or unusually difficult. Compared with such papers set in England, they were merely child's play. This is not only my own judgment, but is supported by the experience of my pupils in the examinations. One of my pupils, though a graduate of a large high school in 1915, had failed in both these subjects in the Yale examinations of that year. Yet in 1916 he got eighty in the algebra and sixty in the plane geometry, though I considered him only an ordinary pupil. Another pupil of little promise got fifty-two in algebra. If he had been a candidate for Harvard, he would have been twelve points above the passing mark, but he has not been accepted at Yale, which makes sixty the passing mark.

Any one with half an eye can see the demoralizing effect upon the secondary schools and colleges in this country of this reactionary step of Harvard. It not only involves great discourtesy to the examiners of the C. E. E. B. in these mathematical subjects, but it distinctly encourages in American youth one of the worst tendencies of the present time, viz., the effort to "get by," and it promotes the greatest injustice to the teachers of other subjects and the pupils who offer them. A pupil may have a natural taste for mathematics but find other subjects hard. Yet in some of these subjects he now has to get a mark of sixty in order to be admitted, but any one who can achieve forty, or less than one-half of the maximum, in these mathematical subjects, is welcomed into the fold. By all the laws of justice and fair play, Harvard was estopped after she adopted the C. E. E. B. examinations from going behind the returns and discriminating in favor of or against any subjects. The boy offering so difficult a subject as Greek or German has just as much right to be accepted on a mark of forty as the candidate in the much easier subjects of algebra and plane geometry. If the Harvard faculty wish to adopt 40 per cent. as a passing mark in the entrance examinations, well and good, but let it apply to all subjects alike, and let it be so announced in the next Harvard catalogue. Then everybody will know where he stands and can make his own choice intelligently.

I wish to impress upon your readers that this is no small matter that I am discussing, but one of the utmost importance. We hear a great deal nowadays about physical preparedness. Well, I am just as much interested in mental preparedness. For twenty years I have preached the unquestioned inferiority of our secondary schools in scholarly attainment and mental training to those of England, France, and Germany, and have done my best to improve the standard, but have been like a voice crying in the wilderness. Now, when a great university, which ought to be the leader in improving the standard, takes so demoralizing and reactionary a step downward as this, I feel that I must protest with all my power, and I hope that I shall not be alone in the protest.

George L. Fox.

New Haven, Conn., September 1.

HUMILIATING NEUTRALITY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: There are two points with regard to Germany's latest crime, the execution of Captain Fryatt, to which, so far as I have seen, attention has not been called in American comments and protests, but which ought to be particularly noted. They are pointed out in the *Spectator* of August 5, which has just reached me. First, Captain Fryatt was executed because, in accordance with his duty, he saved his steamer and the human lives and cargo committed to his care, by trying to ram the submarine which attacked him. *On the same day* on which this occurred (March 28, 1915) the Falaba, which obeyed the German instructions to stop, was sunk with the loss of over one hundred lives.

Secondly, the German Naval-Prize Regulations, issued just before the war, contain the following words: "If an armed enemy merchant vessel offers armed resistance to the right of visit, search, and capture, this is to be broken down by all possible means. The enemy Government is responsible for any damage thereby caused to the ship, cargo, and passengers. The crew are to be treated as prisoners of war. The passengers are to be liberated unless it is proved that they have taken part in the resistance." In executing Captain Fryatt, Germany, therefore, not only violated well-understood international law, but broke her own regulations. Captain Fryatt's execution was murder, nothing else.

And this is the nation with which Professor Münsterberg invites Americans to contemplate an alliance! To my mind it is a national humiliation that we still maintain relations of official friendliness with such a government.

Belgium! Louvain! Aerschot! Termonde! the hostages! the priests! the women and children! the Zeppelin raids! the Lusitania! Neutral in such a war?—"neutral in thought?" Any American who is so, is false to all the ideals which our nation has stood for and still professes. H. Langford Warren.

Silver Lake, N. H., August 19.

JUSTICE TO THE RAILWAYS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: To one who has kept in touch with the railway situation in the United States during the past few years, and who has noted the usual attitude of the more conservative press whenever the question of a "square deal" for our great common carriers has been raised, it seems rather disheartening to find so frequently, at the present crisis, an almost complete reversal of former policies.

To maintain that the eight-hour day for the comparatively few members of four strongly organized unions has "the sanction of the judgment of society"—whatever that well-sounding phrase may mean—is to attempt to dispose of a momentous question, far-reaching in its import, with an utter disregard for the facts and the principles involved.

When we are candid enough to admit that 20 per cent. of the employees of a great public-service industry are trying to dictate not only to the remaining 80 per cent., but also to the holders of $20,000,000,000 worth of stocks and bonds, as well as to a nation of 100,000,000 people, the situation is fairly staggering! Were these 20 per cent. *really* contending for shorter hours, instead of for higher wages, or were they also concerned about the far lower pay of their more numerous fellow workers at the stations and various terminals, it would be easier to feel some sympathy for them.

But when the few who are already in clover seize the psychological moment to extort the utmost concessions from the managers of an industry for many years hopelessly over-regulated and over-burdened, and when so many who are in a position to appeal to the public ear are, because of private interests, upholding the demands of this handful of men who are ready to plunge other employees, and in fact the entire country, into the greatest suffering, a fair-minded observer cannot help but feel that justice is being outraged.

Why does the President defend the claims of the men who threatened to tie up the most extensive transportation system in the world? Why does the popular press so widely sup-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

port him in the stand which he has taken? The answer is easy. In case of a strike, while there would be wholesale suffering, the enormous amount of capital invested in the various manufacturing enterprises and in the newspaper business would be particularly affected, for here rapid transport is almost an essential of existence. At this time the interests of railway capital and other capital do not seem to be identical.

So far as the attitude of our Chief Executive is concerned, that can readily be explained, first, by his frequently demonstrated impracticable "higher idealism" in handling many public questions, and, secondly, by the very natural desire to establish himself in the good graces of that portion of the electorate which may control a majority of the votes next November.

It is exceedingly dangerous for the future of capital and labor to have a man at Washington who can see no way out of the present difficulty but the way of least resistance. Surely the time is ripe for the appearance of a vigorous champion of a "square deal," no matter whose ox is gored.

EDMOND E. LINCOLN.

Cambridge, Mass., September 2.

DISCIPLINE AND DEMOCRACY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: There seems to be a consensus of critical opinion that the great lack in these United States of ours is discipline. We pick up our favorite newspaper, and the leader-writer who moulds our views tells us so. We open the new books on public questions, and the authors expand the same thesis. The preachers and the lecturers swell the chorus, and the college dons, with Professor Münsterberg in the lead, lend to the verdict the weight of their infallibility. Finally, our everyday friend or acquaintance confides to us, as we hang to neighboring straps en route to business, the same belief that this nation above everything else needs discipline. To the want of it are due the popular disregard for law, the hordes of untrained youth, the prevalence of graft, the great catastrophes, and the outbreaks of mob crime. Institute a system of universal discipline and these things will cease to disgrace our civilization.

Now, I would not for a moment dispute the contention of all these persons if by discipline they meant that inward and self-imposed discipline that is the slow growth of years, but yet can be fostered and hastened by proper social organization and enlightened leadership. This kind of discipline cannot become general in a decade, or even in a generation; but every good citizen should strive to promote it, and when it has spread far enough to counteract the evils of democracy a real step forward in human progress will result. The kind of discipline now so loudly demanded, however, is something quite different. It is the kind imposed from without, and its concrete expression is in universal military training. This kind of discipline, I contend, is foreign to the American spirit and destructive of democracy. Ask any young American who has been induced to enlist in the army or navy what he thinks of military discipline and military caste, as their meaning has been unfolded to him, and whether he feels as proud of his American citizenship as before. As Walt Whitman said: "If the present theory of our army and navy is sensible and true, then the rest of America is an unmitigated fraud." Abject submission and unintelligent obedience—frankly preached by our more advanced militarists—mean the abnegation of the individual mind and conscience, the end of individual freedom. Such discipline makes slaves, not men. It comports with a mediæval monarch and an unshaken junkerdom—not with a republic.

Germany before the war was a perfect example of the disciplined nation as some of our exhorters conceive it. The evils rife in America were almost non-existent. Laws were enforced and respected; the youth of the land was trained; graft, if it existed, was at least concealed, not flaunted in the face of the world; great disasters due to lawbreaking or recklessness did not occur; mob outbreaks were unknown. Yet at a nod from its discipline-besotted rulers this great nation of helots hurled itself on Belgium and precipitated a reign of hell on earth. Better American democracy at its very worst, with its contempt of authority, its dishonesty, its mob crimes, and its national motto of "Take a chance!" than such a disciplined society as that!

FRANK C. WELLS.

Philadelphia, August 24.

Literature

A NEW SHAKESPEARE QUARTO.

The Tragedy of King Richard II. Printed for the third time by Valentine Simmes in 1598. Reproduced in facsimile from the unique copy in the library of William Augustus White. With an Introduction by Alfred W. Pollard. London: Bernard Quaritch. 15s.

Very appropriately in this tercentenary year there appears a new Shakespearean Quarto. It was discovered in Brooklyn, in the library of Mr. W. A. White, most hospitable of collectors, by Miss Henrietta C. Bartlett, a bibliographer associated with Mr. Alfred W. Pollard in the recently published "Census of Shakespeare Plays in Quarto." The new find is now photographically reproduced with marvellous accuracy, and furnished with a long and interesting introduction by Mr. Pollard.

Of itself the new Quarto does not contribute a great deal to the establishment of a text; it is another link in an already long chain, standing third chronologically in the series of five Quartos which preceded the First Folio. It was evidently based on the Second Quarto, published in the same year, but it was reset throughout, from the title-page, the slight variations of which in spelling and punctuation led to its recognition, to the end. It corrects some of the errors of its very inaccurate source, and it introduces a commendably small number of errors of its own, some of which descend even to the Fourth and Fifth Quartos, on the latter of which (1615) the First Folio is based. The tempting hypothesis that the new Quarto is the source of the Folio [illegible] is disposed of by the suspicious [illegible] Folio avoids the errors of the Fourth and Fifth Quartos, Mr. Pollard feels compelled to reject on account of the retention of a few of the peculiarities of the latter, such as the spelling "percullist" for "portcullist"; but in the light of the new evidence the derivation of the Folio from the Quarto of 1615 cannot be regarded above question.

Mr. Pollard does not stop, however, with the engagingly clear demonstration of these points; he moves, in this connection, the whole previous question of the relative authority of Quartos and Folio and of the Quartos among themselves. His views on this subject are well known, but he has nowhere expressed himself with more patience and lucidity, nor had a better subject to serve in illustration of his method. His aim, as opposed to the eclecticism of an earlier day or the later worship of the Folio, is to come as nearly as possible to the form which the text presented when it was handed by Shakespeare to the players. This text is likely to be found most intact in a Quarto based on a copy of the play honestly purchased by the publisher from the players. Many of the Quartos were come by in that way, and, though some Quartos were irregularly obtained, each is entitled to be judged on its merits. The First Quarto of "Richard II" was honestly obtained. The printer introduced a number of errors, but this does not prove that his copy was faulty; it merely proves the already well-known fallibility of the Elizabethan printing-house. However imperfect this first printing may have been, it is in a class by itself; no subsequent printing could have any authority, no subsequent reading has any right to inclusion in a critical text, unless it can be shown either that Shakespeare himself revised the proofs or that the printer had fresh access to the author's manuscript. The character of the corrections and of the errors in passing from Quarto to Quarto excludes either of these possibilities. It therefore follows that, though a later Quarto may introduce changes that are obviously right, correct misprints, substitute the right word for the wrong one, such editorial work can be accepted only so far as it carries its own proof with it; so far as it does not, it has no better claim than later editorial conjecture. In the case of "Richard II," the First Quarto would appear to be on the whole pretty faithfully, but not impeccably, set up; the Second Quarto a very bad one indeed; while the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Quartos purge themselves, gradually, but not completely, of the grosser errors; but this process takes place only through the efforts of proofreaders who have nothing but their native ingenuity to guide them.

The Folio stands on a somewhat different level. Though set up, presumably, from the 1615 Quarto—or possibly from the new Third Quarto—it was in part corrected from a copy of the First Quarto which had apparently been used as a prompt-book, the text of which had lost some fifty lines and undergone a variety of minor changes in the course of its score of years and more on the stage. It is impossible to give the reasoning,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

touching upon men as well as on books, by means of which this story is evolved. The general proposition that the text of the First Quarto of "Richard II" stands nearest to what Shakespeare wrote, and that, though the Folio may in part reflect the practice of the playhouse, nothing printed subsequent to the First Quarto derives any independent authority whatever from the author, seems to us as soundly conceived as it is cogently argued. Not every one will feel able to share Mr. Pollard's conviction that the First Quarto was set up directly from Shakespeare's manuscript, reproducing even his dramatic punctuation; but it is an opinion to which one is bound and, indeed, glad to listen.

CURRENT FICTION.

The Plunderers. By Edwin Lefevre. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Elaborate indeed were the hoaxes by which the Plunder Recovery Syndicate diverted the loot accumulated by "rich enemies of society" to its own capacious pockets, combining as they did the most finished methods of a clairvoyant, a stock manipulator, and a Raffles. As artificial studies in inscrutability three of the four are sufficiently amusing, although none of them adds anything to the author's previous revelations of Wall Street psychology. The superhumanly clever thief who manages to give his depredations a reassuringly retributive cast begins to pall, so many and so motley the guises in which he has reappeared since first we made his acquaintance in Sherwood Forest. It seems a pity that Mr. Lefevre should have admitted into his work an imitative strain like this, since his idea of a story, always crisply and clearly expressed, has heretofore been indisputably his own.

The Roundabout. By J. E. Buckrose. New York: George H. Doran Co.

The Mrs. Falconer Jameson who writes under the name J. E. Buckrose has endeared herself to a considerable audience by her pleasant stories of village and domestic life. She writes always with quiet but penetrating humor of types and situations which in their substance are as familiar to us in America as to our British cousins. In this story she presents a chronicle of change, such as all of us who are middle-aged have seen for ourselves. This is the change that has been going on during the past quarter-century from rigid and narrow standards of thought and conduct, in the direction of greater freedom (and license). And, naturally, the main theme is the change in this regard for women. We are shown here a British middle-class family with the bullying paterfamilias and the cowed or secretly rebellious wife and offspring. The parents are firm sticklers for caste; their three daughters not only have no possible future but marriage, but the range of their possible choice is pitifully circumscribed. Of these three one becomes a spinster, stunted and barren in all senses; the second, a discontented old maid, and the third, more or less triumphantly, the wife of an honest man whom, on grounds of caste, her family for a long time refuse to recognize. With this one desperate thrust for liberty, however, the young wife's daring is at an end. She is the transition-wife, bearing on her shoulders the Victorian luggage, though along a new path. Therefore, when her own daughter leaves school, the mother is found taking for granted, as her own mother would have done, that her child is going to settle down at home and await the chances of matrimony. But the daughter is of her generation, a generation strenuously bent, first of all, upon ridding itself of all luggage. She makes her declaration of independence very promptly and none too gently, and goes off to "live her own life," leaving her parents bewildered, but vaguely resigned to the inevitable. At the end, with the military enlistment of the son of the family, upon the outbreak of the present war, we are brought, as in so many current novels, upon the threshold of our own time of crisis.

The World-Mender. By Maxwell Gray. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

The central figure of this well-named story belongs to a type familiar in fiction—the young man of genius, sprung from the masses, and with the ambitions of a reformer. Like others of his class, George Darrell falls in love with a girl much his superior in birth and social position; partly through her help and inspiration he becomes a successful journalist and a political speaker of power. He wins her love; but with his entrance into Parliament and his gradual loss of old ideals in the stress of practical politics they drift apart, and at last he marries a worthless adventuress. The disastrous outcome of this marriage opens his eyes to his moral decline, and he resolves to reject henceforward all compromise, and fight only for his convictions, party or no party. But his convictions have undergone a gradual change; he has lost his old faith in the people and become a believer in a modified form of aristocracy. In fact, he is a convert to the political ideas of the author of the book. The story, however, is in no sense a tract; it is a serious study of the disillusionment of eager and brilliant youth in the corrupted currents of the world. But somehow Mr. Gray never quite comes to grips with his subject. All his characters lack reality; Darrell is conscientiously studied, but not alive; and the saintly and perfect heroine, in particular, is impossible. The reader does not blame George for turning with relief to the more earthly charms of the wicked Duessa. The somewhat exotic character of Mr. Gray's style, now and then recalling Hewlett's, makes it a difficult medium in which to represent plain people. Though the story halt for it, he can never pass by an opportunity for a fine description. Thus he writes: "Later on George's resignation and the manner of it was being discussed at Deerham in the breathless beauty of a red-gold summer evening when the sun's rich sinking was chasing the violet haze from a quiet sea," and so on for a paragraph before we hear any of the discussion. This habit is exasperating to a reader whose temperament is hostile to "skipping." Mr. Gray has done better work on themes more suited to his talents.

THE ORIENTAL CIVILIZATION OF JAPAN.

Pre-Meiji Education in Japan: A Study of Japanese Education previous to the Restoration of 1868. By Frank Alanson Lombard. Tokio, Japan: Methodist Publishing House. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $2 net.

It is a delight to take up the pages of so ripe a scholar and so judicious a psychologist as Professor Lombard, whose "Pre-Meiji Education in Japan" is a real contribution to a living subject. Attached to an institution, the Dōshisha University of Kyōto, which has for long taken a leading place among homes of learning in the Empire, he has been ideally situated for his task. The old capital is still the heart of Japanese art, the centre of Japanese sanctities. When the American Board of Foreign Missions was seeking a home for its activities after the opening up of the country, a suitable field was offered near the abandoned Imperial Palace in Kyōto; and a native scholar, Joseph H. Neesima, whose services were available at the time, lent his personality to the undertaking and gave it force and prestige. Born in the political centre of the Empire, and inheriting its wider bureaucratic outlook, he worked his passage as a young man to Boston, Massachusetts, in order to see Western civilization at first-hand, studied at Amherst and Andover, and returned to Japan excellently equipped for national work; and though his career was prematurely cut short, his ideals remain and fructify. Two of the most valuable books on Japan that have appeared within the past year or two come from the Dōshisha, Harada's "The Faith of Japan," and Gulick's "The American Japanese Problem"; and Professor Lombard's study makes a worthy third.

In his summary of the educational situation as it appears to-day (chapter ix, Educational Problems) the author fully recognizes the fact that for a complete life the modern man must function through the nation; and vice versa that the nation, to have a complete life, must function through the combined ideals of its individuals, acting through their trusted leaders. If enlightened selfishness is the vital rule of life for the nation, it must be so for the individuals within it; and if such an interpretation of life is contemptible in the individual, it is also contemptible in the nation. Two hundred years ago in Japan, one of its great teachers, Nakae-Tōju, known as the Sage of Omi, led a revolt against the cold official Confucian orthodoxy of the day, and appealed to the men of light and leading

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whose successors have made New Japan. Identifying knowledge with action, he declared that from the Emperor to the commoner, man's chief aim should be the ordering of life. Those who hungered for an intellectual justification of life and duty became his eager disciples. "The one thing Nakae-Tōju esteemed was character. He unified the human conscience with that of the ultimate, and there rested his ethical teaching, making self-will in the form of desire the root of all evil. For mere knowledge he had only contempt, holding a man, ignorant of letters and unable to read, truly educated if virtuous and in harmony with his conscience" (p. 111).

A hard and unsatisfying official orthodoxy is again dominant, and Japan has need of another Sage of Omi. Professor Lombard has some weighty paragraphs dealing with this subject. "It must be admitted," he declares at page 233, "that the present state of Japanese morality is low, according to her own standards, and that the instruction in her schools is not accomplishing what is desired in the lives of the people. Unavoidable circumstances are in part answerable for this; but to some the difficulty seems to lie in the fact that what has been lost in the old, through modern thought, has not been replaced by any vital element, nor can be, except by one essentially religious." The attempt to impose a religion, fashioned by the Government because it recognizes that religion is of value in ethical endeavor, has been abortive:

> In reality, religion, though unnamed, has been the source and authority of all that was vital in Japan's ethical past; and the efficient ethics of her future can be established, not on the polite fiction of a pseudo-religion, the doctrine of a uniquely divine authority dwelling within the personality of her rulers, but only on the reality of an essentially divine view of human life and its destiny being actualized in society.

The book throws light upon another question which no historian has yet dealt with adequately: How came it that Buddhism, the religion of peace and of the preservation of life, should, in Japan, have become the creed of the high-strung warrior? The Zen form of Buddhism has, indeed, been termed the "Religion of the Samurai." Japan had her Dark Ages as well as Europe, when her Government was forced to abandon all efforts for education. In this period of political anarchy the Buddhist monasteries and temples constituted the shelter of learning and the only source from which it could be acquired. The five principal monasteries of Kyōto and Kamakura were, as Count Okuma tells us in his "Fifty Years of New Japan," the centre at once of the Zen teaching and also of literature, and they were frequented by the children of military men. "But these so-called temple schools," says Professor Lombard, "were more often held in the retired cottage of the priest; and thus the name (*terakoya*) came to have the general significance of private primary school. . . . They were often opened by [illegible] public-spirited men or taught by *rōnin* [illegible] Masuyoshin" [illegible]), twice on page 128, diers of fortune, men for the time without feudal allegiance." Compare in Scotland of days past the "stickit minister," who, finding no place in the pulpit, so often turned his attention to teaching. "Although in the later years . . . the *terakoya* took on greater activity, and were occasionally aided by the government, they remained essentially private schools, of worth largely according to the personality of their teachers and in general fostered from the Buddhist and humanitarian rather than Confucian and governmental motives."

The author's remarks on the education of women in Japan are very informative. The twelve long centuries when Japan was absorbing and adapting a higher civilization—that of China—could not well be favorable to the development of the individual; for the culture and philosophy gave woman emphatically a subordinate place in society. And yet, though the first records were compiled under the influence of the new conditions, they show the Japanese woman "possessing remarkable freedom, and the entire range of history and social custom in Japan makes evident that the measure of subordination which she suffered from the force of Confucian and Buddhist teachings was unnatural to the instincts of the Yamato race." The home life has always allowed great freedom to the girls of the family, and they learned much in an accidental way from their brothers. Moreover, they had to look forward to the management of the home and its expenses, as matrons, "which from the first was the Japanese woman's duty and prerogative"; and they thus received the elements at least of practical education. The use of the simplified syllabary was taught to girls, but they were not expected to learn the Chinese ideographs; and yet, oddly enough, as Professor Lombard tells us, it is from the literary productions of women that we first gain an idea of the education attained by them. Poetry, indeed, became, as a Japanese student once quaintly remarked to the reviewer, "the occupation of the little literary lady," taking on a feminine flavor:

> After Confucian and Buddhist ideas had subordinated woman beneath the triple law of obedience to her father, her husband, and her son, the education of a pleasure-loving age trained her in accomplishments which brought her into conspicuous prominence, so that we have the strange phenomenon of woman becoming more cultured in grace of intellect at the time when her personal inferiority was most clearly established (page 127).

The author finds a parallel in Athens, where it was the *hetairai* who sought to enhance their charms by intellectual culture.

On a fly-leaf facing the table of contents is a judicious "Note" on pronunciation which might be of some service to authors dealing with things Japanese. The book does credit to the Japanese firm [illegible] out, misspelli[illegible] and the wh[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

"England of Mine," he looks back to an undated period when his country was "noble, wise, . . . loving, tender, true," instead of being, as at present, "peevish, pious, sad." In the only national struggle comparable to the present, that is, the long war with the French Republic and with Napoleon, the British Cabinet met in fear of assassination, and the regalia in the Tower was packed for flight into the country. A brief study of the contemporary caricatures would show that the civilian temper then was composed of fear and hate in equal parts. Every feature of the present situation finds its fellow a century ago.

Most curious of all the reactions is the conversion of this particular Englishman to the Prussian conception of war. He does not use the term biological necessity, but no sabre-rattling, jack-booted *Junker* could outdo him in glorifying the organized murder and massacre of nations which is called war. For example, "No great awakening has ever come except by war. It is the great stimulant, spiritual and physical." "God is behind the big battalions. The nation which is too foolish and too cowardly to prepare for war and do its utmost when war comes cannot expect to live. Nor is it fit to live. There is no room here for fools and cowards." This is a complete German justification for the extinction of Belgium, Servia, and Poland. *Vicisti, O von Bernhardi!*

Notes

Harper & Brothers announce the publication this week of "The World for Sale," by Sir Gilbert Parker.

Henry Holt & Company announce for early publication the following volumes: "Mountain Interval," by Robert Frost, and Lieut. Coningsby Dawson's "Slaves of Freedom."

The three following works on art will be published by the Century Company in October: "The Art of Rodin: with Leaves from his Note-Book," by Judith Cladel; "A History of Ornament," by A. D. F. Hamlin, and "The New Interior," by Hazel H. Adler.

The American-Scandinavian Foundation announces for publication this autumn volumes five and six of its series of Scandinavian classics: The "Prose Edda," by Snorri Sturluson, translated by Arthur Gilchrist Brodeur, and "Modern Icelandic Plays," by Johann Sigurjónsson, translated by Henninge Krohn Schanche.

John W. Luce & Company announce the publication of Lord Dunsany's "The Last Book of Wonder." Other volumes to be issued shortly by this firm are "Six Days of the Irish Republic," by L. G. Redmond-Howard, and "Six Plays of the Yiddish Theatre," by various authors, edited and translated by Isaac Goldberg.

Houghton Mifflin Company announces for publication on Saturday: The Variorum Edition of Shakespeare's "Sonnets," edited by Raymond MacDonald Alden; "The Motorists' Almanac," by W. L. Stoddard; "Letters from France," translated by H. M. C.; "The Story of Scotch," by Enos A. Mills; "Speaking of Home," by Lillian Hart Tyron; a new revised edition of Edward Stanwood's "History of the Presidency"; "Prints and their Makers," by FitzRoy Carrington; a new edition of William Dean Howells's "Buying a Horse." The same house publishes this week "The Wall Street Girl," by Frederick Orin Bartlett. "Skinner's Dress Suit," by Henry C. Rowland, is announced for publication on September 30.

It was an exciting trip that Walter Hale made "By Motor to the Firing Line" (Century; $1.50 net). The motor operated chiefly in the sectors of Rheims and Arras, but first and last looked in on many other parts of the line. Photographs and vigorous sketches by the author, made sometimes under fire, add to the vividness of the narration. Mr. Hale brings the perspective, a pathetic one, of familiar acquaintance with the lovely provinces of northern France in time of peace. His account of the wanton and needless destruction of beautiful buildings is appallingly circumstantial. The needless German ugliness has had no severer indictment. In general Mr. Hale's record necessarily repeats much in the other chroniclers, but he finds a principle of novelty in combining his various experiences in an imaginary motor tour of "no man's land," the trench region, beginning in the uplands of Alsace and ending at the North Sea dikes. As regards the spirit of the French enduring the daily hell of barbaric onslaught it is a very heartening book.

Volume III of the University of California Publications in History is devoted to a number of special studies by Prof. Herbert E. Bolton, to which he has given the collective title "Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century." It is well known that Professor Bolton's knowledge of the manuscript material for Texas history is unrivalled; and these studies are, as one might guess, on aspects of Texas history about which nothing, or next to nothing, can be learned from secondary sources. This is not true of the first chapter, which is a survey of Texas history from 1731 to 1788; but it holds of the rest of the volume, which is devoted to "The San Xavier Missions," "The Reorganization of the Lower Gulf Coast," "Spanish Activities on the Lower Trinity River," and "The Removal from and the Reoccupation of Eastern Texas." All these are monograph studies, exact and detailed, constituting notable additions to our knowledge of Texas history. If they have a fault it is perhaps in the excess of detail. Professor Bolton, one suspects, has the antiquarian instinct strongly developed; and something of the antiquarian's weakness, namely, the disposition to suppose the importance of new knowledge equal to the pleasure of discovering it. The value of the volume is enhanced by twelve maps, ten of which are contemporary, eight of the ten never having been published before. Especially useful for the student or teacher who has only a general interest in Texas history is the large and excellently executed reference map of Texas, compiled by Professor Bolton himself.

The entertaining and vivid sketches of fighting from the British lines in Boyd Cable's "Action Front" (Dutton; $1.35 net) are a worthy continuation of his first success, "Between the Lines." The latter endeavored to illuminate the non-combatant regarding the terse and cryptic official dispatches of various phases of the fighting vouchsafed us by the censor. Apparently insignificant items like the taking of a trench or the subsequent counter-attack, or night patrols and bombing parties, were minutely described with full credit for the adventure and inconspicuous bravery they entailed. In "Action Front" Mr. Cable has injected some of the inevitable humor of irrepressible Thomas Atkins to lighten the grimness of these stirring incidents. Thus the humor of "In the Enemy's Hands" has quite as much of reality as the glimpse it gives of the doctrine of "strafing," while the sheer animal spirits distilled in "As Others See," where the French and British temperaments are happily juxtaposed, the author has shown to be a vein worth developing. Pathos and grimness and humor are well handled by Mr. Cable, though his idea of American slang gives us pause for reflection. So thoroughly have the British adopted our slang from their music hall stage that the endeavor to isolate his Americanisms in "A Benevolent Neutral" is like convoying coals to Newcastle, while our transatlantic exports seem to have suffered "a sea-change." The authentic atmosphere derived from a first-hand experience immediately behind the scenes recommends Mr. Cable's vivid sketches to those war-readers already surfeited with its tangled polemics.

The artist and the angler are pleasurably combined in "American Trout-Stream Insects," by Louis Rhead (Stokes; $2.50 net). Mr. Rhead has wrought into the volume the patient toil of seven seasons, finding the insects often harder to capture than the trout themselves. In all cases he has painted from the living specimens, since the characteristic colors fade at once with death. His specimens were taken while wading and fishing in the Beaverkill River, of the Catskill region, and include a good selection of the insects on which the trout were found to be freely feeding during each month of the season, from April to August. For every fly taken alive on the surface, Mr. Rhead is sure, a thousand are consumed drowned, under water or near the surface. By far the larger number of insects eaten by trout are too heavy to float. Thus it is the height of folly, he thinks, to fish exclusively with dry flies on the surface. The typical dry-fly angler, however, arrives at his conclusion by a wholly different route and would hardly regard Mr. Rhead's premises as pertinent to the question. The frontispiece of the volume, by the way, is a pencil drawing of one of the well-known champions of the dry fly, George La Branche, author of "The Dry Fly in Swift Water," which proves that the two schools are at least not wading too far apart for mutual self-respect. After a few miscellaneous chapters on various aspects of fly-fishing, Mr. Rhead devotes the last fifty pages to certain artificial nature lures of recent invention, imitations of minnows, grasshoppers, caterpillars, helgramites, lamper eels, etc.

Why the editors of the International Theological Library should have gone out of their way to translate an unimportant foreign book on the mediæval church, like André Lagarde's "The Latin Church in the Middle Ages" (translated by Archibald Alexander. Scribner; $2.50 net), is, in view of the high character of most of their publications, not clear.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Certainly there is an abundance of American, not to say English, scholars who could have done the work far better. The arrangement of the present volume is topical, a certain advantage if space allows a sufficiently detailed account of the several topics, but inevitably confusing in a handbook where the ground covered is very extensive and the space limited. It involves frequent repetition and prevents any effect of unity. The author, whose identity we have failed to establish by reference to all available bibliographical aids, has worked in many sources and gives us the means of following his steps. The book will be of some use to elementary students, who are seeking guidance on specific points, but it cannot be read continuously with profit. The point of view as regards controverted questions is in the main fair. The translation has the effect of accuracy, though it cannot be verified by comparison with the original.

"Jeffery Amherst," by Lawrence Shaw Mayo (Longmans, Green; $2), is an excellent brief account of the English general whose career was so closely bound up with the American colonies. The work is based mainly upon the printed sources and the best secondary material; and if it adds little to our knowledge of the subject, it presents that knowledge in systematic form and reaches conclusions that are judicious and convincing. It is not difficult to be judicious about Amherst, for few men of historical importance are less likely to enlist an author's enthusiasm or to arouse his strong hostility. As a general he never took any chances or suffered any notable defeat. Where foresight and careful preparation were essential, Amherst was the man; where a little genius was required, he did not fill the bill. The chief weaknesses of Amherst, however, were not on the military side; and it is mainly for the way in which he wore his honors, rather than for the way in which he won them, that a little apology is necessary for this particular hero. "His own services," as George III well said, "though very great, would not be lessened if he left the appreciating them to others." Mr. Mayo has appreciated the man and his services very justly.

Discussions of the origins of the war are no longer limited to the diplomatic exchanges just before the outbreak of hostilities. In books and in conversation the perspective is now much more extended in order that the ultimate origins of the war may some day be determined. Prof. Charles Seymour, of Yale, takes 1870 as a starting-point in his new book, "The Diplomatic Background of the War. 1870-1914" (Yale University Press; $2 net). Professor Seymour amply redeems the promise of his title as well as that of his preface: "to correlate in their logical sequence the most significant [diplomatic] events of recent European history." Logical sequence, in fact, is one of the happy features of the book. After a somewhat labored Introduction Professor Seymour proceeds with excellent command of his subject and with fine sense of proportion to discuss Bismarck and the Triple Alliance, the Dual Alliance, German World Policy (both Economic and Moral), British Foreign Policy, the Diplomatic Revolution (in France and England), the Conflict of Alliances, the Near Eastern Question, the Balkan Wars, the Crisis of 1914, and the Diplomatic Break.

Drama

"PIERROT THE PRODIGAL."

To the present generation of playgoers in New York Michel Carré's "L'Enfant prodigue" has been a name only. It was played here in the nineties by the same French company which had given it with considerable success in London, and it was also produced, we believe unsuccessfully, by Augustin Daly and his company. On seeing the delightful presentation of the piece at the Booth Theatre one wonders why managers have allowed a generation to pass without reviving it, and one is correspondingly grateful to Mr. Winthrop Ames and Mr. Walter Knight for the extremely capable and tasteful production which they have now given to this little classic of dumb show. The change of title seems to us regrettable, but was perhaps well advised as conveying more meaning to the general public than the French original.

"L'Enfant prodigue"—the story of the prodigal Pierrot who robbed his father for love of his mistress, returning home in beggar's rags when deserted by her, and winning his father's forgivenesss when the sound of martial music points the way to redemption—achieved its present perfection by gradual stages. Written as a spoken play by Michel Carré, it was embellished with incidental music by André Wormser. The music, however, proved so attractive that gradually it was allowed to encroach more and more on the spoken lines, until at last the idea occurred of eliminating the words altogether and playing the piece in dumb show to the musical accompaniment. Perhaps only by this means could the perfection of accord of music, meaning, and gesture have been achieved.

Certainly for those who have never seen "L'Enfant prodigue" it is a privilege which Mr. Ames and Mr. Knight now extend, and those who, like the present reviewer, have no standard of comparison will find it difficult to conceive of a happier presentation of the piece than is given by the admirable cast at the Booth Theatre. Miss Marjorie Patterson's Pierrot is full of grace, and is played throughout with intelligent appreciation of the significance of each gesture. In the second act, when Pierrot finds himself deserted by Phrynette, she gives a vivid picture of desolation, and the pathos of the return home and the dawning hope of ultimate redemption as the martial music sounds are admirably envisaged. No better illustration of the force of gesture intelligently used could be found than in the playing of Paul Clerget and of Mlle. Gabrielle Perrier, as Pierrot's father and mother, the perfect timing of action to music being particularly noticeable. As an exposition of pure pantomimic art we are inclined to regard the performance of Mlle. Perrier as perhaps the best in the piece. Miss Margot Kelly, brought into the cast at the last moment on account of the illness of the actress who was to have played Phrynette, proved the physical and temperamental embodiment of the heartless cocotte. If her performance, as was inevitable under the circumstances, was noticeably less precise and well considered in gesture than the others, that is a fault which a few performances will remedy and which was more than atoned for by the natural adaptability to the part of her own radiant personality. A carefully studied and broadly humorous impersonation of the Baron was given by Emile J. de Varney, and the cast was completed by the intelligently played servant of Charles Dubuis. No notice of this charming production would be complete which did not contain a tribute to the admirable rendering of Wormser's music by a capable orchestra, under the direction of Elliott Schenck, and an acknowledgment of the exquisite setting for the second act, in Phrynette's boudoir. S. W.

"THE FLAME."

If he would preserve his sanity, we recommend the playgoer who sees this "new American play" at the Lyric Theatre to fasten his attention exclusively upon the stage pictures, which are beautiful, resolutely restraining any inclination to follow the ramifications of the plot. Of that, also in the interest of sanity, we shall not attempt to give any outline. It is as though the author had determined to stage a musical comedy for the purpose of refuting the usual charge against that form of entertainment of paucity of plot; had got together a large and impressive cast; had provided an elaborate production, and had at the last minute decided to cut out the lyrics, to have only incidental music, and to call the thing, not a musical comedy, but a new American play. On the whole, it seems quite improbable that this epoch-making native product would have seen the footlights at all had it not been for the fortunate coincidence that the author was Richard Walton Tully and the producer Richard Walton Tully, Inc.

The scenes of the play, the programme informs us, "transpire [*sic*] somewhere in a land bordering on the Gulf of Mexico or the Caribbean Sea." In other words, the scenes are laid in Mexico, and the play has for one of its principal objects political propaganda. One gathers that the Administration's Mexican policy has not been so fortunate as to commend itself to Mr. Tully. Apart from this, the most definite impression made by the piece, one gathers further that Mr. Tully is interested in ethnological research. "The Flame" apparently represents an attempt to combine into a play the results of Mr. Tully's political cogitations and of his ethnological researches, and we get a wild and nonsensical farrago of sun worship and voodooism and politics and most other subjects that can be found between the covers of a handy encyclopædia. Money must have been poured out like water on the production, and we can only regret that such lavish and beautiful mounting has been wasted on so rubbishy a play. S. W.

"THE MAN WHO CAME BACK."

Apparently the edict has gone forth from the Custom House that all dramatic goods this season are to be labelled with the place of their origin, for William A. Brady presents this offering also, the first of the season at the Playhouse, as "a new American play." The only part of the description to which objection might be taken is the epithet "new." This is not to accuse of plagiarism Mr. Jules Eckert Goodman, who has adapted the play from the story of the same name by John Fleming Wilson; it is merely to point out that the opium den has become a familiar

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stage setting on Broadway, and that the story of the rich man's son who is turned adrift by his father until such time as he shall have "made good" is one that has occurred to other writers.

Henry Potter, having squandered much of his father's substance in riotous living in New York, receives from his justly incensed parent $500 and a ticket for San Francisco, where he is to go to work in one of the numerous offices of Thomas Potter. That is the "First Episode," after which, the programme considerately informs us, *more tabularum moventium*, that "the distance from New York to San Francisco is 3,170 miles." Similar exact information as to the distance from San Francisco to Shanghai, from Shanghai to Honolulu, and from Honolulu to New York is recorded after the three succeeding "episodes." Thus we find the educative influence of the movies extending beneficently to the legitimate drama. The tags are also valuable as indicating successive stages of the rake's career. In San Francisco we find him at a dance hall, congenially employed in carrying out his threat to his father to make the name of Potter infamous. Here also we meet Marcelle, the dancing girl, who is good and pure and in love with young Potter, the reward of her devotion being a dishonorable proposal from him. The Third Episode contains the "big scene," in an opium joint near Shanghai. Potter, drifting in drunk and seeking drink, is astonished and properly shocked—since he has mentally reserved the use of drugs as one lower depth to which he may yet descend—to find Marcelle there, an habituée of the place. The big scene, in which explanations take place, and at the end of which Potter and Marcelle decide to marry and redeem the past and one another, is undeniably effective in a meretricious and theatrical style, as is also much of the Fourth Episode, where we find Potter and Marcelle at their task of mutual redemption.

We need not trace the plot further. The author shows himself a good dramatic workman in the manufacture of effective situations, but the piece is made by the admirable acting of two young players in the principal rôles, Miss Mary Nash and Henry Hull. Miss Nash, who has been seen to advantage in the past two or three seasons in character parts, here shows herself capable of playing an exacting emotional rôle with intense realism, but without exaggeration, and with a quite remarkable power of restraint. Mr. Hull is equally good in the part of Henry Potter, a difficult rôle, calling for considerable versatility. Of the rest of the cast, which is extremely well selected, we can mention only Edward Emery's capital characterization of the millionaire father, Thomas Potter; Ernest Lawford's easy performance as Capt. Trevelyan, who is really a detective, and a neat character study of the demimonde by Miss Maud Campbell. S. W.

"MR. LAZARUS."

A farcical comedy of unusual naturalness and truth, though with melodramatic elements, the "Mr. Lazarus" of Harvey J. O'Higgins and Harriet Ford, presented at the Shubert, conveys a portion of its story in its title. It deals with the chance return of a rich miner to the home of the "widow" who has long supposed him dead, and who had, indeed, remarried. Twenty years before the curtain rises John Molloy, upon his honeymoon with his bride, is believed to have been killed and incinerated in a railway wreck. The putative widow, moving to New York, has there taken the residence he owned and the insurance upon his life and opened a boarding-house to support herself and her daughter Patricia. She has also made the error of accepting as second husband a medical quack named Sylvester, who is enabled by her and Patricia's toil to live, with his own empty-headed daughter, in ease; and who, when the play begins, is seeking to obtain his wife's last pennies to bring out a medical treatise in which he places unbounded faith. The miner Molloy, who has changed his name to Lazarus, descends upon her by accident, and is astounded when he learns her own and Patricia's identity. The scenes in which it is made clear to the audience that he is actually Molloy are awkward and needlessly long. He is shocked, of course, to witness the selfish and cold-blooded brutality with which Sylvester is treating the wife and daughter, and he at once constitutes himself an unofficial guardian of the two. He is abetted by a young artist, who has also taken rooms in the house, and who has developed an attachment for Patricia, attractive in spite of her drudge's capacity. In the course of one of his clashes with the rascally Sylvester, the "widow" recognizes him, and after a stormy scene, also slightly too long, Sylvester is forever ejected. The sequel is handled with more of artistic verity than either the identification of Molloy or the elimination of the blackguardly medical quack. Mrs. Molloy-Sylvester proposes to make her new-found husband a model of domestic propriety, and he, with his Western breeziness and love of personal liberty—one of his habits is that of sleeping on the floor—scents the danger, and quietly makes off, first providing for her comfort, and seeing the artist and Patricia happily united. The bright and characteristic dialogue, the variety, ease, and naturalness of the incidents, and the smooth and competent acting unite to give a quiet distinction to the drama. The finished impersonation of Mr. Lazarus by Henry E. Dixey deserves an especial word of praise, as does that of Patricia by Eva Le Gallienne. A. N.

Finance

IN A "PRESIDENTIAL YEAR."

To Wall Street and the financial community at large, the action of President Wilson in the railway-wage dispute, and the vigorous criticism of that action by Mr. Hughes, have thus far been almost the first strong reminder that this is a Presidential year. The Republican candidate's "swing around the circle," with speeches which certainly seemed to most people rather as belonging to 1888 than to 1916, caused passing comment and momentary perplexity; but no such feeling was aroused by them as was evoked by the famous "primary contest" of four years ago. Even up to the present writing, with the national campaign about to be fully launched, there is little discussion in financial quarters about the issue, and less excitement.

Yet there is possibly no more thoroughly time-honored tradition in the financial markets than the tradition of "bad business in a Presidential year." For a good deal more than a generation, business men would be apt to say, when leap-year began, that they must sail close to the wind in their business plans, for this was an election year. If things went badly with them in that period, they would always explain it on the ground of "political unsettlement." Why, then, has this point of view been so strikingly absent on the present occasion?

One obvious answer is that nobody except the stump speakers seems to be in a state of alarm over the possible success of either candidate. There is no Bryan in the field, as in 1896, and no chance of transfer of Government, as in 1884, to a party out of power for twenty-four years, whose actual policies were a matter of conjecture. Both candidates have been tested in public office, where neither ran wild and both were governed by generally conservative instincts.

But the present apathy of Wall Street to the political contest suggests the familiar inquiry, whether the tradition as to the effect of "Presidential years" on business is well grounded or not. It does not altogether stand the test. Out of the eleven electoral years from 1872 to 1912 inclusive, four were distinctly bad years in general trade, two were on the whole unsettled, and five were years of unquestionable business prosperity. The five good business years were 1872, 1880, 1900, 1904, and 1912.

Regarding the four years when trade was bad, the curious fact is that their character was without exception fixed in advance by causes which had nothing to do with the Presidential election. The electoral contest of 1876 began when the worst reaction from the panic of 1873 was beginning to be felt; in 1883 a Wall Street panic occurred, two months before the nominations; 1896 came under the full force of reaction from the great panic of 1893, and 1908 was the immediate aftermath of another panic. There are left only 1888 and 1892, whose exact character, in a business way, is less easy to fix.

If it were to be assumed, from this analysis, that Presidential years are "bad years for business" only when business is already upset for other reasons, then we should have an explanation both for the calmness of the business world in 1912, when even the tariff was at issue, and in the present year. For 1912 was a period of tangible and genuine revival of trade in the United States until the whole world's financial horizon was overcast by the Balkan War, and nobody (except on the stump) has challenged the reality of prosperity in 1916. It may still be asked whether business confidence may not be upset by this autumn's political developments. It certainly would be if Wall Street and the business world were to accept at 100 per cent. valuation the predictions and warnings of the campaign orators. But Wall Street is reasonably familiar with campaign oratory.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

FICTION.

Bartlett, F. O. The Wall Street Girl. Houghton Mifflin. $1.35 net.
Delano, E. B. June. Houghton Mifflin. $1.25 net.
Doyle, L. Mr. Wildridge of the Bank. Stokes. $1.30 net.
Dyer, W. A. Gulliver the Great. Century. $1.35 net.
Graeve, O. The Keys of the City. Century. $1.35 net.
Harraden, B. The Guiding Thread. Stokes. $1.35 net.
Reeve, A. B. The Social Gangster. Hearst Intern. Lib. Co. $1.25 net.
Roland, J. The Six-Pointed Cross in the Dust. Stokes. $1.30 net.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Benham, A. R. English Literature from Widsith to the Death of Chaucer. Yale Univ. Press. $2.50 net.
Chalmers, S. The Penny Piper of Saranac. Houghton Mifflin. 75 cents.
Colmer, F. Shakespeare in Time of War. Dutton. $1.35 net.
Knight, W. A. The Pictureland of the Heart. Pilgrim Press. $1.25 net.

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY.

Elwell-Sutton, A. S. Humanity versus Un-Humanity. T. Fisher Unwin. 4s. 6d. net.
Crompton, R. H. The Future of Christianity. T. Fisher Unwin. 6s. net.
Quin, M. The Problem of Human Peace. T. Fisher Unwin. 7s. 6d. net.

GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMICS.

Creel, G. Wilson and the Issues. Century. 60 cents net.
Filsinger, E. B. Exporting to Latin America. Appleton. $3 net.
Gill, C. National Power and Prosperity. Introduction by G. Unwin. T. Fisher Unwin. 4s. 6d. net.
Kilduff, E. J. The Private Secretary. Century. $1.20 net.
Woolf, L. S. International Government. Brentano. $2 net.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Belloc, H. The Elements of the Great War. Second Phase. Hearst Intern. Lib. Co. $1.50 net.
Friends of France. The Field Service of the American Ambulance Described by its Members. Houghton Mifflin. $2 net.
Hovelaque, E. The Deeper Causes of the War. Dutton. $1.25 net.
Shakespeare's England: An Account of the Life and Manners of His Age. Vols. I and II. Oxford University Press. 25s. net set.
Spender, H. General Botha—The Career and the Man. Houghton Mifflin. $2 net.
Van Doren, M. Henry David Thoreau. Houghton Mifflin. $1.25 net.

POETRY.

Barnett, H. G. The Roof of the World. Sherman, French. $1.50.
Hilles, H. Untravelled Trails. Sherman, French. $1.50.
Howard, K. The Little God. Sherman, French. $1.50 net.

SCIENCE.

Ramsey, A. R. J., and Weston, H. C. A Manual on Explosives. Dutton. $1 net.
Ruggles, C. L'H. Stresses in Wire-Wrapped Guns and in Gun Carriages. J. Wiley & Sons.

DRAMA AND MUSIC.

Moses, M. J. Heinrich Conried. Crowell. $2.50 net.
The Truth About the Theatre. Anonymous. Cincinnati: Stewart & Kidd Co. $1 net.

JUVENILE.

Cather, K. D. Boyhood Stories of Famous Men. Century. $1.25 net.
Ford, R. C. Campfire and Trail. Rand, McNally.
Sherman, C. L. The Dot Mystery. Houghton Mifflin. $1 net.
Smith, E. B. In the Land of Make Believe. Holt.
Snell, R. J. Little White Fox and His Arctic Friends. Little, Brown. 75 cents net.
Verrill, A. H. Jungle Chums. Holt. $1.35 net.
Wade, M. H. Pilgrims of To-day. Little, Brown. $1 net.

TEXTBOOKS.

Breslich, E. R. Second-Year Mathematics. University of Chicago Press. $1 net.
Clark, J. S. A Study of English and American Writers. Vol. III. Additions by J. R. Odell. Row, Peterson.

Hill and Smith's Advanced French Composition

By R. T. Hill, Assistant Professor in Yale University, and H. E. Smith, Instructor in the same. 187 pp. 12mo. $1.00.

A series of exercises based on selections taken from articles in some of the best contemporary French periodicals and newspapers.

Part I is literary in character and deals with such subjects as Henry Bordeaux, Romain Rolland, Mistral, De Vogüe, Rostand, and Maeterlinck, as well as with some of the 17th Century writers.

Part II treats of other matters connected with French history and geography, such as Versailles, Morocco, Strasburg, the Basques, etc. It also contains passages on French aviation, French athletics, etc. While not elementary, the book is not too difficult for students who have had no more than two years of French.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY
34 W. 33d St., NEW YORK 6 Park St., BOSTON 623 So. Wabash Av. CHICAGO

The Cambridge Book of Poetry for Children

Compiled by Kenneth Grahame

Author of "Dream Days," "The Golden Age," etc.

Crown 8° Picture end papers. $1.50.

This volume is compiled *for* children and not *about* them. Mr. Grahame has made his collection chiefly one of lyrical verse, because, as he says, "As an introduction to English Poetry there is no better portal than this."

All Booksellers—All Prices Net

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
New York London

Studies in History, Economics and Public Law

Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.

Vol. LXXI. THE COMMERCE OF LOUISIANA DURING THE FRENCH REGIME, 1699-1763.

By N. M. MILLER SURREY, Ph.D., 8vo. Pp. 476. *Paper Covers.* $3.50;* Cloth, $4.00*.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., Publishers

From Mons to Ypres with General French

A Personal Narrative, By FREDERIC COLEMAN

"To read Mr. Coleman's leisurely personal narrative is as near to having the actual experience of living and working in the battle zone as, perhaps, it is possible to get out of a book."—*New York Times.*

With fifty illustrations from photographs taken by the author. $1.50 net.

DODD, MEAD & COMPANY, NEW YORK

"OUR EASTERN QUESTION"

By Thomas F. Millard
Editor of "The China Press"

An authoritative analysis of the colliding interests of Japan and the United States. 32 illustrations and 26 appendices. 543 pages. ***Price $3.00 net***

At all bookstores. Published by
THE CENTURY CO.

By Lajpat Rai
A Leader of the Indian Nationalist Movement

Young India

An Interpretation and a History of the Nationalist Movement from Within

With 8 portraits. At all bookstores, $1.50 net.

B. W. Huebsch, Publisher New York

THOMAS NAST:
HIS PERIOD AND HIS PICTURES.
By ALBERT BIGELOW PAINE.

Of particular importance during a Presidential year is the life of America's best-known cartoonist, whose pencil invented many familiar party symbols—the Tiger, the Elephant, the Donkey, and others. This new edition, at a lower price, puts this important work within the reach of every one.

$2.50 net

HARPER & BROTHERS

OUR COMPLETE CATALOGUE

of publications of science, philosophy, and literature will be sent to any address on request.
The UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, CHICAGO, ILL.

The Original Malted Milk
Nourishing
Delicious
Digestible

The powder dissolves in water. Needs no cooking—Keep it on hand.
Rich Milk, Malted grain extract in powder.
For Infants, Invalids and growing children.
Pure nutrition, upbuilding the whole body.
Invigorates nursing mothers, and the aged.
The Original Food-Drink for all ages.
More nourishing than tea, coffee, etc.
In the home, or at Hotels and Cafes.
Substitutes cost YOU Same Price.

BIG BOOK CATALOG FREE
Books of General and Special Interest
THE JOHN C. WINSTON COMPANY
902 Winston Building Philadelphia

BINDER FOR THE NATION
To receive the current number in a convenient (temporary) form. Substantially made, bound in cloth, with THE NATION stamped on the side in gold. Holds about one volume. Papers easily and neatly adjusted. Sent, postpaid, on receipt of 75 cents. Address The Nation, 20 Vesey Street, New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED